

UC-NRLF





\$B 75 970

REPORT
OF THE
FIFTH UNIVERSAL
PEACE CONGRESS,
CHICAGO,
AUGUST, 1893.

BOSTON :
THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

GIFT OF





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

OFFICIAL REPORT
OF THE
FIFTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS

HELD AT
CHICAGO, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AUGUST 14 TO 20, 1893,

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE
World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian
Exposition.

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
BOSTON.

JX 1930
45
1893

TO VINU
AIRPORT LAD

"Not Things, But Men."

THE WORLD'S CONGRESS AUXILIARY
OF THE
WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION OF 1893.

President: CHARLES C. BONNEY.

Vice-President: THOMAS B. BRYAN. Treasurer: LYMAN J. GAGE.

Secretaries: BENJ. BUTTERWORTH, CLARENCE E. YOUNG.

WOMAN'S BRANCH OF THE AUXILIARY.

MRS. POTTER PALMER, President.

MRS. CHARLES HENROTIN, Vice-President.

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT.

GENERAL DIVISION OF ARBITRATION AND PEACE.

Committee of Organization.

THOMAS B. BRYAN, Chairman.

MURRAY F. TULEY,

JAMES T. RALEIGH,

GEORGE F. STONE,

JESSE A. BALDWIN,

GEORGE N. BOARDMAN,

BENJ. F. TRUEBLOOD,

ALLEN W. FLITCRAFT,

J. M. FISKE,

WILLIAM B. BOGERT,

T. J. LAWRENCE,

CHARLES H. HOWARD.

Woman's Committee of Organization.

MRS. THOMAS J. LAWRENCE, Chairman.

MRS. MARTHA FOOTE CROW, MRS. FREDERICK A. SMITH,

MRS. I. S. BLACKWELDER.

Committee on Program and Correspondence.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Chairman. GEORGE F. STONE,

MRS. FREDERICK A. SMITH.

PEACE AND ARBITRATION CONGRESS.

HON. JOSIAH QUINCY,

Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.,
President.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D.,

Secretary of the American Peace Society, Boston,
Secretary.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

SIR JOSEPH W. PEASE, M. P., London;

FREDERIC PASSY, Member of the Institute, Paris;

FREDRIK BAJER, M. P., Copenhagen;

BJÖRNSTJÖRNE BJÖRNSSON, Aulestad, Norway;

THE BARONESS VON SUTTNER, Vienna;

DR. FRANZ WIRTH, Frankfort;

* LOUIS RUCHONNET, Federal Counsellor, Berne;

AUGUSTE COUVREUR, Brussels;

E. T. MONETA, Milan;

HODGSON PRATT, Esq., London;

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM, England;

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, Boston;

ALFRED H. LOVE, Philadelphia;

HON. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, New York.

* Deceased since the Congress.

PROGRAM OF THE FIFTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS.

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 8 P. M.

OPENING SESSION.

- 1 ADDRESSES OF WELCOME.
 - 2 "THE WHITE CITY BY THE INLAND SEA."
Poem, Hezekiah Butterworth, Boston.
 - 3 ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS.
 - 4 RESPONSES BY DELEGATES FROM DIFFERENT NATIONS.
-

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 10 A. M.

Peace Societies and Congresses.

- 1 Poem, Maria Louise Eve, Augusta, Ga.
 - 2 Origin, Principles and Purposes of Peace Societies,
W. Evans Darby, LL.D., London.
 - 3 History and Work of Peace Societies in Europe,
William C. Braithwaite, Counsellor at Law, London.
 - 4 History and Work of Peace Societies in America,
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D., Boston.
 - 5 Peace Congresses, Conferences and the International Peace Bureau,
Elie Ducommun, Secretary International Peace Bureau, Berne.
-

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 3 P. M.

Economic Aspects of War.

- 1 Waste of Life and Property, etc., Hon. David Dudley Field, New York,
and Hon. Angelo Mazzoleni, Milan, Italy.
- 2 What is War? E. T. Moneta, Editor of *Il Secolo*, Milan, Italy.
- 3 Burdens Inflicted on the People by War,
Dr. Adolf Richter, Pforzheim, Germany.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 10 A. M.

Woman and War.

- 1 Poem, Mrs. Martha D. Lincoln (*Bessie Beach*), Washington.
 - 2 The Curse of War Upon Woman, Rev. Amanda Deyo, Scranton, Pa.
 - 3 The Peace Flag as a Means of Education as Well as Arbitration,
Mrs. Mary Frost Ormsby, New York.
 - 4 "The Woman's Corps of the Bleeding Heart,"
Mrs. Edward Roby, Chicago.
 - 5 Woman's Power to Uphold or to Suppress War,
Mrs. L. Ormiston Chant, London.
 - 6 Organizations of Women for the Promotion of Peace.
-

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 3 P. M.

Special Conference.

Ecclesiastical Conference, in Reference to a Petition from the Various Christian Bodies of the World to Governments in Behalf of Arbitration.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 10 A. M.

International Arbitration.

- 1 A Military Man's View of Arbitration,
General Charles H. Howard, Chicago.
- 2 Organization of a Permanent International Court of Arbitration; Its Advantages, Constitution, Powers, Limitations, Proceedings, Location, etc.
 - (a) Draft of a Plan for Such a Court,
Hon. W. Allen Butler, Hon. Dorman B. Eaton and Mr. Cephas Brainerd, New York.
 - (b) Advantages of a Permanent Court; Difficulty of Creating Tribunals for Special Cases, Sir Edmond Hornby, London.
 - (c) The Permanent International Tribunal,
Edward Everett Hale, Boston.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 3 P. M.

Law of Nations.

- 1 The Reform of International Law; Possibility of its Codification by a Permanent International Tribunal,

Dr. Fred J. Tomkins, A. M., D. C. L., Denver, Colo.

- 2 The Pan-American Congress; What it has Accomplished,
Hon. William E. Curtis, Late Chief of Bureau of American Republics,
Washington.

Addresses by Sr. Don Nicanor Bolet Peraza, Venezuela; Sr. Don Manuel D. Peralta, Costa Rica, and others.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 18, 10 A. M.

The Fraternal Union of Peoples.

- 1 International Animositities; How They may be Removed,
Hodgson Pratt, Esq., President International Arbitration and Peace
Association, London.

- 2 Motives and Means,

Ex-Gov. John W. Hoyt, LL.D., Washington, D. C.

- 3 The Proper Relation of Nationality to Internationalism,
Rev. George Dana Boardman, D. D., LL.D., Philadelphia. A report
on this subject by the International Peace Bureau will also be read.

- 4 Prophecies of Peace and War,
Christian Arbitration and Peace Society, by its Secretary, Rev. H. S.
Clubb, Philadelphia.
-

FRIDAY, AUGUST 18, 3 P. M.

Special meeting of the Delegates of the Peace Societies. Subjects to be considered:

- 1 Time and Place of the Next Peace Congress.
- 2 Peace Propaganda, in the Schools, in the Press, etc.
- 3 Representation of Peace Societies in the Peace Congresses.
- 4 The Universal Peace Petition.
- 5 Propositions with Reference to Disarmament and Conversion of Armies into Instruments of Industry.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19, 10 A. M.

- 1 Tribunals for the Settlement of Conflicts between Labor and Capital.
 - 2 State Boards of Arbitration and Conciliation,
Charles H. Walcott, President Massachusetts State Board of Arbitration.
 - 3 Courts of Conciliation,
Wm. Watts Folwell, Professor of Political Science and Lecturer on International Law in the University of Minnesota.
 - 4 Commercial Arbitration by Boards of Trade,
Mr. H. H. Aldrich, Board of Trade, Chicago.
-

SUNDAY, AUGUST 20, 10.30 A. M.

Religious Peace Service.

- Rev. George Dana Boardman, D. D., LL.D., President.
- 1 The Moral and Social Aspects of War,
Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D. D., Boston.
 - 2 The Religious Principles of the Peace Movement,
Rev. Julius E. Grammer, D. D., Baltimore.

FIFTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS, CHICAGO.

AUGUST 14 TO 20, 1893.

FIRST SESSION.

The Fifth Universal Peace Congress was called to order at 8 P. M., August 14, 1893, in the Hall of Washington, Permanent Memorial Art Palace, Chicago, by Hon. C. C. Bonney, President of the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition.

The Divine blessing on the labors of the Congress was invoked by Dr. W. Evans Darby, of London.

Mr. Bonney, on opening the Congress, made the following address of welcome :

Friends of Arbitration and Peace; of Peace on Earth and Good Will among men —In the name of the Prince of Peace, whose Kingdom we seek to advance, in the name of the World's Congress Auxiliary, by which this Congress has been convened, and in the name of the Government of the United States, which has invited the attendance and participation of all other Nations, I give you cordial greeting.

The original announcement of the World's Congresses of 1893 was sent by this Government to the Governments of other Countries, and named among the great themes which the Congress will consider the following subjects: the grounds of fraternal union; the language, literature, domestic life, religion, science, art and civil institutions of different peoples; also international law as a bond of union and a means of mutual protection and how it may be best enlarged, perfected and authoritatively expressed; also the establishment of the principles of judicial justice as the supreme law of international relations, and the general substitution of arbitration for war in the settlement of international controversies.

In the organization of the department of government of the World's Congress Auxiliary, of which the Congress on Arbitration and Peace forms one of the general divisions, and the other Congresses which were held during the last week, other divisions, these subjects were amplified, and the following among other

specifications given: the advantages that would result from the establishment of a permanent International Court of Justice to declare the law and the right of all such cases as would be submitted to it either for advice or for decision; the organization of such a permanent International Court of Justice, how the members should be appointed, how its powers should be defined and limited, how its proceedings should be regulated, when and where its terms should be held, etc.; also the expediency of establishing Courts of Conciliation and compelling suitors to resort thereto in the first instance. Publications containing these and other announcements were also sent by the Government of the United States to other nations. These subjects were thoroughly set forth in the preliminary address issued by the Committee of Organization in charge of the Congress. The Congress therefore convenes with a fixed and definite purpose and all the peace societies of America, and of other countries, have been cordially invited to unite in the work for which we have assembled.

In the nature of things government is power and must have authority to protect itself and its subjects against internal disorders and external foes. By the establishment of a universal reign of peace we do not mean the abdication of government, but the substitution of the dominion of law for the dominion of force, of moral for physical power. As in private life the courts of justice have actually and successfully taken the place of personal conflict, as in the American Republic the supreme court of the nation has for more than a century successfully decided controversies between powerful States, so we believe it to be entirely practical for civilized nations to establish an International Court of Justice for the determination of differences between them. And we believe that the worst decision which such a tribunal would ever make would be better than the best result of war. If the American States had been compelled to keep standing armies for their protection, the present wonderful prosperity could never have been attained.

Thus in seeking to extend the reign of law and justice and to substitute judicial tribunals for armies, we are following the teachings of reason and experience, and not the dreams of enthusiasts nor the speculations of theorists. Among civilized nations the moral force of a decision of an International Tribunal would generally secure compliance, and probably no other coercion than that of non-intercourse would ever be required.

The whole series of the World's Congresses of 1893 really constitute one great Congress on Peace, of which this particular Convention may be regarded as the crowning part. (Applause.)

This Congress, like the others of the series, has been organized by what is termed a Committee of Organization, or rather by a dual Committee of Organization consisting of a committee of men and a committee of women. There is in the World's Con-

gress Auxiliary a woman's branch or department, the representative and practical head of which, Mrs. Charles Henrotin, is with us on the platform to-night. The chairman of the General Committee of Organization, the Hon. Thomas B. Bryan, whose duties as Commissioner General of the World's Columbian Exposition and its representative in Europe, have made him well and widely known in that continent as well as in our own, for the Committees of Organization, will add some further words of welcome to those which I have had the pleasure of saying.

MR. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—In Congresses of this character I believe that those who represent the ranking organizations should welcome those from abroad, with the exception, of course, of the Congress Auxiliary, whose duty it is to welcome all guests. I have only a single word, and that would be of course an echo of the welcome that has been extended to you, were it not that the word echo implies a feeble return of the original sound, unless it be an Alpine echo which sometimes is five or six times repeated. I desire most cordially to welcome all those who are present.

I am delighted to see, if not a very large audience, at least a very able representation of delegates from all quarters of the globe. I cast my eye around the line of the platform just before I rose before you, and it was gratifying to see them coming from Italy where I attended the Peace Congress nearly two years ago, and to see even from Africa a representative, and from China representatives, and from that mighty Empire, great in war and great in peace, Germany, and it is delightful to see men coming from all parts of the globe ready to rally under that highest of all banners, the banner of the Prince of Peace.

MR. BONNEY: While Mrs. Henrotin has asked to be excused from making an address on this occasion, I must beg the privilege of presenting her to you, and she will say who will speak for her.

MRS. HENROTIN: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—Madame Wisinger, who comes as the representative of the Baroness Von Suttner, will speak the words of welcome for the woman's branch. Those of you, and I am sure you are many, who have read that impassioned appeal for peace of the Baroness, will gladly welcome her representative in this hall.

MR. BONNEY: I have now the pleasure of presenting to you Mr. Hezekiah Butterworth, one of the editors of the *Youth's Companion*, known all over the world through that foremost representative of the interests of the young, who will read a poem on the White City as the true emblem of the coming peace of the world.

Mr. Butterworth then read the following ode:

WHITE CITY BY THE INLAND SEA.

Columbus, pilot of the Aryan race,
 Before whose prow the heavens rose in gold,
 Behind whose keel the ocean backward rolled,
 We sing thy praise, O seer,
 On this our Secular year;
 And that New Pilot that as years increase
 Shall life's uncharted mysteries unfold,
 And glorious lead the race of heaven to peace!

I.

"Come see ye a day that no eye ever saw,
 Nor again shall be seen by the living!"
 So the sweet notes of peace blew the trumpets of war,
 For Rome's century feast of thanksgiving;
 The century feast of Minerva and Pan,
 Of the golden wheat fields of Latona,
 The feast that the games of the heroes began,
 The feast of the Cycles of honor;
 The Seculum (1) grand that the destinies sung
 In the centuries thrilling with story;
 When the heralds went forth and the clear trumpets rung
 Through the air and the arches of glory—
 "Come see ye the day that no eye ever saw,
 Nor again shall be seen by the living;
 Come see ye the day!
 Come see ye the day!
 The Seculum! Feast of thanksgiving!"

II.

Grander trumpets than Rome's in the Appian Way
 In our ears, O my brothers, are ringing;
 They have summoned the nations: "Come see ye the day
 That the mountains and hills have been singing;
 Come see ye the day that awakened the strain
 When the golden lyres trembled o'er Bethlehem's plain,
 That the prophet by Shiloh foresung in his lays,
 That Virgil re-echoed in Pollio's praise,
 That to number the Aryan races have trod
 Through ages of toil the new highways of God,

That the end of the faith of all heroes shall prove,
 And crown all the martyrs with laurels of love !
 Come see ye the day that man never saw,
 The day that shall *silence* the trumpets of war,
 And forever shall live;
 Come see ye the day ! ”

III.

Long the trumps have been sounding. Them Phocion heard.
 Aurelius in night marches olden;
 Them Rome, that stood still at Concordia's word,
 To sing 'mid her harvesties golden.
 The white Essenes heard them, the Waldenses' tents,
 The Palmers of peace, 'neath the skies of Provence;
 Pestalozzi who gave the Free School to mankind,
 Where boldly the Alpine Cross blew in the wind;
 Them Wilberforce heard, them Cobden and Bright,
 The Quakeress Mott, them Sumner and Wright,
 And grand San Martin, (2) who obedient laid down
 Incarial gold and Peruvian crown,
 And young Salaverry, who peace peans sung
 Where the Andes above him their irises hung.
 New Italy (3) heard them, and summoned from far
 The nobles of peace to her dead halls of war,
 And the white-bordered flag of America lay
 On the old gladiator ! immortal the day !
 (4) *We* heard them that morn, when the banner unfurled
 O'er Sandy Hook's waters to welcome the world,
 And the navies passed by and beheld on the height
 The White-Bordered Flag in the war-clouded light.
 When the White City set its new domes in the air,
 And the angels at night in the skies gathered there,
 And o'er it were lifted the gates of the sun,
 And heaven to the workmen had answered, well done !
 The jubilant trumps, down earth's Appian Way,
 Ring forth to all peoples: “ Come see ye the day.
 Come see ye the day that no man ever saw,
 The day that shall *silence* the annals of war,
 And forever shall live;
 Come see ye the day ! ”

IV.

O, Aryan race, whose *Seculums* rolled
 Through Rome's old republic of splendor,
 Thy pilot, Columbus, to-day we behold,
 And our tribute to science we render.

We, a New Pilot wait while the peace bugles play,
 And the trumpets blow sweet down the Appian Way,
 And memories bold of the heroes of old
 Send forth the new steeds of the cycles of gold;
 Come see ye the day that no man ever saw,
 But forever shall live;
 Come see ye the day!

V.

White City by the inland sea, all hail!
 Four hundred years from that immortal morn
 When shook the new found earth the Pinta's guns,
 And science, liberty, and peace were born,
 All hail!
 Now Time her last melodious cycles runs
 And gathers here her new creation's sons,
 Senate of God, all hail!
 To give to man his birthright, and the world
 The peace it claims from sacredness of blood;
 To honest toil the wealth that it creates;
 To make the earth a brotherhood of states
 Beneath a flag for all mankind unfurled,
 And self to lose in universal good,
 Senate of God, all hail!
 Thine is the noblest work since time began,
 Thine is the final parliament of man!
 Ye've heard the bugles by the heralds blown
 From yon White City under God's white throne.
 Senate of God, all hail!

VI.

Columbus, pilot of the Aryan race,
 Before whose prow the heavens arose in gold,
 Behind whose keel back rolled the ocean old,
 We sing thy praise, O seer,
 On this our secular year!

VII.

He stood on the prow, our Æneas of old,
 And heard the mad tongues round him murmur;
 Forsaken by the earth, his eye read the stars
 And his foot on the waves but grew firmer;
 The night of suspense spread her wings o'er the deep,
 The night of hope, terror and wonder,

And the winds held their breath, and in silence like death
 Came a flash, and the echoing thunder
 Rolled back from the shores of the ocean imperaled,
 Rolled back from the hills of the new rising world!
 No lighthouse arose o'er the coral-reefed sea,
 No bell in the incapes rang warning,
 But the hero of faith wheeled the planet to see
 In the west the red climes of the morning.
 "Let processions be made, let grand anthems be sung!"*
 Said the pilot of God, and rejoicing,
 His word we obey on this secular day,
 The heart of humanity voicing;
 The happy bells play, like the trumpets, and say
 "Come see ye the day
 That forever shall live;
 Come see ye the day!"

VIII.

Sing, ships of the sea, that the western waves cleave
 In the track of the caravels olden,
 That the nations in bonds of strong brotherhood weave,
 And mingle earth's harvesties golden!
 Sing, sing of your hero, ye hills of Genoa,
 Sing, isles of that morning wonder,
 That heard 'mid the palms of the echoing shore
 The guns of the caravel thunder.
 Sing, mighty procession of seas upon seas,
 Whose mysteries the whitened sails cover!
 Azorean ports, bright winged Caribbees,
 That around the broad continent hover!
 Sing, wide seas of Hesper, ye grand hills, and say
 While the trumpets of peace lead festive the way,
 "Come see ye the day
 That forever shall live;
 Come see ye the day!"

IX.

Columbus, pilot of the Aryan race,
 'Neath Hesper's star we wait a pilot new,
 For new achievement, greater toils to face
 Than Argonaut or bold Alcides knew,
 To rise for Truth, and still the seas of blood,
 And lead mankind to equal brotherhood.
 Who shall it be? What power shall bid war cease?
 Thou answerest me, "White-Bordered Flag of Peace!"

* These were Columbus' own words.

Oh, white evangel, by the angels rolled
Out of the skies, thy signal we behold.

The silver trumpets blow across the world,
From the White City to the inland sea,

To see God's banner in the West unfurled,
Senate of God, for thee!

Three thousand years the Aryan race has marched
'Neath Hesper's torch towards the returning West.

The Indus and the Oxus gave the word:

Advance!

O'er Iran's desert and Caucasian steppe
The order ran 'neath burning olive trees:

Advance!

Across Marmora's fleet and windy waves
Still rolled the human tide, and up the Danube passed.
The Adriatic smiled, and came the Rhine and Rhone
To bring them welcome; still there came the word:

Advance!

The pioneers swept o'er the Pyrenees
To meet the Xenil and the Guadalquiver,
And face the sunset waves of mystery.
Then came the Pilot walking on the main,
Upborne by Truth and Destiny to meet
The brother races of the blue Antilles;
But the same voice was heard upon the deep:

Advance!

Then rose the three Americas in sunset air,
And o'er sierras blazing in the sky
From lands of inland seas and mighty vales
Down to the shores of the Pacific tide
The restless race their ancient legends bore!
Halt, pioneers, ye face the east again!
The path of Science happy Freedom trod!
And lo! came peace down from the heights of God!
And her White City built of irises and wings
In the great valley by the inland seas!
And called from all the lands her sons, and rolled
Her White Flag o'er the sun walls, and proclaimed:

Advance!

X.

O, Freedom, I sing the new hope of thy story
On this festival day, and the flags of thy glory
I would girdle with songs white as angels of light!

The pilot returned not when back came the Argo,
 But Orpheus, singing, to Troy brought the cargo
 Of golden-fleeced treasures! O, sons of the heroes,
 Earth's pilots return not, but all who have given
 To Freedom their blood, and wrong downward have driven,
 Have fought for the peace that the angels of heaven
 Sang forth from the stars, over Bethlehem burning —
 Your Argo of peace is from Colchis returning.

XI.

Whene'er we meet the friends once fondly cherished,
 And hands all warm with old affection take,
 Then let us breathe the names of those who perish
 On fields of honor for their country's sake.

They come no more when spring-time birds are singing;
 When trills the swallow 'neath the shady eaves;
 When light in air the summer bells are swinging
 Above the ripple of the tender leaves.

They come no more when bugles sweet are blowing
 The notes of Peace, on Freedom's natal days;
 They hear no more, in softened numbers flowing,
 The strain that tells the patriotic heroes' praise.

Oh, blest are they whose lives are nobly ended;
 No dark dishonor shall they e'er receive;
 From peril flown, to God's pure light ascended,
 Victorious through the ages long to live.

Whene'er we sing of lives of heroes ended,
 And marbles to their dust a tribute give,
 From chiefs who first their harvest fields defended,
 To patriots scarred, who in our memories live,

Comrades, remember that not yet defeated
 Are all the wrongs for which they fought and died;
 In us alone the work can be completed
 Of patriots slain or prophets crucified.

What say ye, men, whose shades arise in glory,
 Ye long processions that with years increase?
 Ye answer back from every age of story,
 "Make yonder flag the harbinger of peace."

"Man cannot pay the honor that is due us
 Till War, the Mower, lays his weapons down,
 And from the heights that festal centuries view us
 Shall Peace the tomb of every soldier crown."

XII.

O Liberty, time brings her harvest peace to thee!
 I sing the song that Salaverry (5) sung,
 The warrior poet, o'er whose white camps hung
 The frozen irises of Andean skies,
 And whose celestial vision saw arise
 The flag of Peace, humanity to free :

1

"Ye warriors of freedom, ye champions of right,
 Sheathe your swords to sweet harmony's strains,
 No bayonet should gleam and no soldier should fight
 Where Liberty glorious reigns.

2

"Melt your lances to ploughshares, your swords into spades,
 And furrow for harvests your plains,
 No shock of the battle should startle the shades
 Where Liberty glorious reigns.

3

"But Plenty should follow where Peace leads the way,
 And Beneficence waken her strains,
 Let the war bugles cease and the peace minstrels play
 Where glorious Liberty reigns.

4

"Nor honor is won from the battlefield red,
 Nor glory from tumult and strife,
 That soldier is only by godlike thought led
 Who offers his country his life.

5

"Ye warriors of freedom, ye champions of right,
 Sheathe your swords to sweet harmony's strains;
 No bayonet should gleam and no soldier should fight
 Where glorious Liberty reigns!"

XIII.

White City by the inland sea, all hail!
 Above thy domes one breeze all flags are blowing,
 Thou art the future, irised, sun-crowned, glowing,
 And War to greet thee drops his coat of mail.
 Loud cries the Past from her dead fields of blood :

Disarm!

The world of Christ obedient to her Lord:

Disarm!

The toilers of all lands with one accord :

Disarm!

The mothers of all lands in one grand word:

Disarm!

The children leading the New World's brotherhood:

Disarm!

And all who men's life-blood as sacred hold,

And all who live for men and not their gold,

And the long future as her gates unfold:

Disarm!

XIV.

All bright with the fields of the harvest to-day,

Time moves to its destinies splendid,

And Freedom triumphant is leading the way

By Science and Progress defended.

The School heads the march of the banner of God,

In the way Pestalozzi in clear visions trod,

And truth is the end of endeavor,

And our Washington's fame and our grand Lincoln's name

Shall ring in the trumpets forever!

Hail, stars of the dawn! Hail, bright harvest morn!

The Destinies say to the spindles, go on!

The trumpets are sounding! "Arise and essay,

Come see ye the day

That forever shall live;

Come see ye the day!"

XV.

Messiah of nations, let centuries hail

Thy secular year of Thanksgiving;

Like the Romans of old, let them tell the grand tale

That is heard only once by the living.

The new march of Knowledge and Progress appears,

And Chronos is winding the clock of the years,

A hundred thanksgivings shall follow the sun,

And this grand year of Colon shall bind them as one,

And the centuries sing

As the peace trumpets play,

Like the Romans of old down the Appian Way --

Come see ye the day

That forever shall live;

Come see ye the day!

White City by the inland sea, all hail!

The Aryan race that erst Columbus led
O'er living seas with hope's uncharted sail
Takes the White-Bordered Flag of Liberty
For her New Pilot, and goes forth from thee

To bless the living and to crown the dead.
Loud cries the Past from her dead fields of blood ;

Advance!

The world of Christ, obedient to her Lord ;

Advance!

The toilers of all lands with one accord ;

Advance!

The mothers of all lands in one grand word ;

Advance!

The children leading the New World's brotherhood ;

Advance!

This day that no living man ever saw,
With white hand closes the black gates of war,
And ne'er shall end till from the Aryan race
The sun shall hide on its last fire his face.
Halt, serried hosts! Reverse the sword and lance!

White-Bordered Flag, advance!

White City by the inland sea, all hail!

White-Bordered Flag of Liberty,

That thence the pilot of the race shall be,

All hail! All hail!

Senate of God, all hail!

NOTES.

(1) The Roman Seculum or century festival was ushered in by the heralds who proclaimed, "Come see ye a day that no man living ever saw, and ever shall see again!" Horace wrote his "*Carmen Seculare*" for the Seculum in the reign of Augustus. The last Roman Seculum was celebrated in honor of the one thousandth birthday of Rome.

(2) San Martin, the liberator of Argentina, Chile and Peru, refused the military leadership of Argentina, ten thousand ounces of gold from Chile, and when offered the supreme power of Peru, answered,— "The presence of a fortunate general is detrimental to the State. I have achieved the independence of Peru ; I have ceased to be a public man." He exiled himself for the peace of these republics and died in poverty at Boulogne.

(3) The White-Bordered Flag of the Human Freedom League of the Pan-American Congress was presented to the Peace Congress in the Art Palace in Rome by Mary Frost Ormsby, and was by an accident thrown over the statue of the Gladiator at one of the public meetings, which was hailed as an auspicious omen.

(4) On the first day of the grand Naval Review, the Daughters of the American Revolution raised the "Flag that welcomes the World" on the Navesink Highlands. The White-Bordered Flag of the Human Freedom League was hung over the fortress. The naval ships passing in line into New York harbor there beheld the first White-Bordered Flag.

(5) Salaverry. This patriot caught the spirit of peace while leading the army of the Andes. We have quoted his famous peace poem and have copied a few lines of the popular English translation of it in our rendering.

MR. BONNEY: From the inception of the World's Congress work, the Department of State of the United States Government has been its steadfast and zealous friend. No service which that department could render in its behalf has ever been withheld. Again and again it has been a medium of communication between the World's Congress Auxiliary and the peoples of the different countries of the world. It is therefore with peculiar pleasure that I announce that the presiding officer of this Congress during its succeeding sessions will be the Hon. Josiah Quincy, Assistant Secretary of State. I have the pleasure of presenting to you Mr. Quincy, who will now deliver his inaugural address.

MR. QUINCY: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE ARBITRATION AND PEACE CONGRESS:

I thank you sincerely for the honor of being called to preside over the deliberations of this body. Believing with full conviction that the future belongs to the cause of peace, and that at no distant period arbitration will take the place of warfare between civilized nations as a means for the settlement of their differences I am glad to join in this international meeting of those who are working to hasten the coming of that time.

If we are asked to state what important or direct result a meeting of this character can be expected to accomplish we may not be able to give in advance a very specific answer; but I think that there is one great fact of our day which gives to this Congress and its deliberations an eminently practical character. That is the fact that public opinion is now a more distinct and complete thing than it has ever been in the past, and that it governs the civilized world to a greater extent than ever before. It is this public opinion which we are here to endeavor to affect, to shape toward the belief that in the present stage in the development of mankind wars between nations are barbarous and unnecessary; that the questions that they are supposed to settle, but which they generally fail so grievously to permanently adjust, can be better settled through other agencies. However forms of government may differ among civilized powers at the present day, in nearly every one of them public opinion controls the action of the government. It is only within our time that the means have existed through which this public opinion could intelligently form itself, and the organs through which it could find expression when formed. The people are now at last being educated to think and to understand, to grasp the fact that they have the power to rule themselves. The modern growth of the press, and the general and constant discussion of questions of public interest which it makes possible, is developing the reasoning powers of the people and giving to intelligent thought a force which it never before possessed. This public opinion in spite of its temporary aberrations is becoming more and more a thinking and intelligent opinion. While the inherited ideas of the people, and the old

prejudices which have come down from the past, may still seem slow to change, reason is now sure to assert its sway in the long run, and progressive views will in the end prevail over all indifference or opposition. It is to the public opinion of thinking men everywhere that we make our appeal. If through this Congress we can in any measure make an impression upon the men who form and create public opinion, if we can plant some seed of thought where it may take root and in due season bring forth fruit an hundred fold, if we can attract the attention and win the sympathy of some who have not yet been enlisted in the cause of peace, if we can increase, by ever so little, that body of intelligent thought which is now making itself felt against all international warfare, then we can claim a practical result for this Congress in the highest sense of the word. In this year of national hospitality it is a pleasant duty to extend to the advocates of peace who have come from other lands to attend this Congress a hearty welcome to a country which can fairly claim to rank as the most pacific among the great powers of the earth. Owing largely to the good fortune of its geographical position, the United States has been enabled to attain its growth as a purely industrial nation in which the military organization plays such a minor part that it is almost lost sight of. Its people, starting upon their national life upon a new continent, remote from the inherited antipathies and causes of dispute existing upon the continent of Europe, have been enabled, in spite of the three wars into which they have been drawn since the establishment of their independence, to develop a great civilization of a more purely peaceful character than the world has ever before seen. But it is not my purpose to claim this result as due to anything more than fortunate circumstances, still less to make any comparison disparaging to other nations whose development, proceeding under very different conditions, has not yet carried them beyond the semi-military stage of civilization. In a brief introductory address I do not flatter myself that I can advance any new ideas upon a theme which has been the subject of such full and able discussion, nor shall I attempt a detailed examination of any of the specific problems confronting us, which can be more properly dealt with in the comprehensive series of papers which are to be presented by other members of this body. But it may not be inappropriate, by way of general introduction to the addresses which are to follow, to devote a little time, in view of the unique position which the United States occupies in the international peace movement, to considering the peculiar causes which give it such a marked pacific character and make it a factor of constantly growing importance in the establishment of a permanent status of peace among civilized nations. All countries should learn to profit by the experience of each, and in spite of wide differences of conditions it will be readily conceded that the nations of the old world may find some useful lessons embodied in the political experience of the United States.

The first of these lessons seems to me to be that the union of a large population under one government, and the extension of a single political authority over a wide area of territory, or, in other words, the formation of a great nation has a powerful tendency towards the maintenance of peace. The reasons why this is so are tolerably obvious. A large powerful nation has less reason than a smaller and weaker power to fear invasion or attack. It may, to be sure, have an equally strong country as its neighbor, as is the case in some instances in Europe, but it is eminently true of nations that large bodies move slowly, and the very magnitude of the forces that would confront each other of itself tends to maintain a condition of political equilibrium. Under modern conditions the sense of responsibility in rulers, whether hereditary or elective, grows with the importance of the interests entrusted to their charge. The problem of maintaining peace between a small number of great powers is a simpler and easier one than that of maintaining peace among a large number of small powers as the experience of the world has abundantly testified. The position of absolutely unquestioned security which the United States occupies, not only among the nations of the American continent but among all the countries of the world, is the most striking example which history can show of the peaceful influence of a great nation. It has beyond all question been a most fortunate thing for the world that so large a part of the territory of the North American continent has been united under one government. The strength of this nation not only renders it absolutely secure against aggression on the part of the nations which occupy the adjacent territory, but it affords to these same nations an assurance against aggression on the part of a country too great to stand in need of territorial expansion unless with the free consent of both the peoples concerned. Just as the formation of great industrial organizations, which have been so prominent a feature of recent times, tends under wise management towards the establishment of industrial stability and the maintenance of industrial peace, so the formation of great political aggregates, if these are wisely governed, tends towards political stability and international peace. The smaller the number of the powers which divide the earth's surface between them, the greater becomes the chance of the maintenance of peace, for thus we approach more nearly toward that final unity of all mankind under one government which constitutes the political ideal.

But the successful maintenance of such great national units is only possible in fully civilized nations under certain essential conditions of internal government. The formation of a great nation is of little value if it proves to be a house divided against itself. National unity requires internal harmony. Civil war is even more unfortunate than warfare between different nations. It is true that the United States has given the world the most stupendous example of civil conflict to be found in history; but this must not

cause us to overlook the fact that this country has also given to the world its best type of a closely knit political organization, extending over a vast territory, and successfully holding together a great population, exhibiting the greatest diversity of interest, occupation and surroundings. National unity on a great scale can be secured only in two ways — by centralized imperialism or by local self-government. The former rests of necessity upon an insecure foundation and affords no guaranty of permanency; it belongs rather to the past than to the future. The latter, on the other hand, with the elasticity and opportunity for growth which it gives to the political system, affords the best possible basis for lasting unity.

The federal system as it has been developed in the United States, the union under a federal government of limited powers of States which retain full rights of local government, not so large in territory as to include too great diversity of interest, must rank as a political discovery of the first importance. It was the great elasticity of our system of State governments joined together in a federal nation which kept this country united up to the time of the Civil War, and which has enabled it with such wonderful rapidity to recover from the consequences of that war and to bring about a complete restoration of the old political status. It is altogether unlikely that it would be possible to hold together this nation, in spite of its territorial unity, if legislative and executive power were entirely centralized at Washington. Our federal system has shown the world the possibility of uniting under a single government of limited powers a large number of self-governing States, and of so creating a great nation peculiarly adapted for the maintenance both of internal and external peace.

The direct participation of the people in their own government and free choice of their own rulers, is, in my opinion, another influence that tends strongly to give a pacific character to the United States. The great body of the people have always been less inclined to war than the ruling classes who have governed them in the past. The ambitions of individuals, which have played so large a part formerly in bringing on wars, are almost entirely eliminated under a great democracy. Nor is there much possibility under such a government that war will be entered upon to distract the attention of the people from their domestic affairs, and to prevent internal political changes. In so far, therefore, as this country has developed and illustrated the principles of democracy, and has afforded to the peoples of other nations an object lesson of the possibility of self-government under universal suffrage, it has set forces in motion which are making, and must continue to make, for the peace of the world.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that the United States has, in its Supreme Court, established a tribunal bearing a closer analogy to the international court, which is the ideal at which the peace movement aims, than any other yet created by man.

A court in which self-governing States appear as plaintiffs and defendants, even though they are united by a federal bond, must certainly be regarded as a step towards that still higher tribunal which we hope and believe that the nations of the earth will one day establish for the settlement of disputes between them. It is an encouraging fact that in our experience with this court no suspicion has ever been entertained that in the decision of questions between the States, its judgments have been in any wise affected by the State citizenship of its judges.

Before passing from the subject of the pacific character and influence of the United States, let me occupy a few moments in some numerical comparisons between this country, as the type of a purely industrial nation, and France and Germany, as types of the nations in which the military organization is carried to the highest point. These comparisons, I need not say, are made in no invidious or critical spirit, but merely to bring more clearly before our minds what a mere state of preparation for possible war means as contrasted with a condition of real peace.

In this country, with an area, excluding Alaska, of 2,970,000 square miles and a population of 66,000,000, we have a standing army which since the close of the Civil War has been limited to 25,000 men; or one soldier to 119 square miles of territory and to each 2640 inhabitants. In Germany, with an area of 208,000 square miles and a population of 49,500,000, there is now a standing army, on the peace footing, of 547,000, or over two soldiers to each square mile of territory and one soldier to each 90 inhabitants. In France, with an area of 204,000 square miles and a population of 38,300,000, there is a standing army, on the peace footing, of 560,000, or nearly three soldiers to each square mile of territory, and one soldier to each 68 inhabitants.

If we compare the expense per capita of the population of maintaining these standing armies, we find that Germany, with an annual army expenditure of \$115,000,000, pays \$2.33 per inhabitant, and France, with an army expenditure of \$129,000,000, pays \$3.37 per inhabitant, while the United States, with its expenditure of \$47,000,000, pays \$0.71 per inhabitant. The annual expense of the German army is \$211 for each soldier, that of the French army \$230, and that of the army of the United States \$1880. The excessive cost of the army of the United States for each soldier, as compared with those of Germany and France, while no doubt largely due to the greater comparative expense of maintaining a small number of men and the size of the territory over which they have to be distributed, affords a striking illustration of the vastly different conditions which must govern the organization of an army in a country whose institutions are based upon pure democracy from those which prevail in countries having other forms of government and different political ideas. The United States obtains men for its standing army by voluntary enlistment; the adoption of any other method in time of peace would be con-

sidered contrary to the genius of our institutions. This means that our government must secure soldiers upon the same basis as that on which it secures other employes; namely, by offering them a sufficient inducement in the form of pay to enter its service. The government is obliged to compete with private employers of labor, and it can only secure the quota for its army by making its terms sufficiently inviting, the conditions of the service being considered, to attract a sufficient number of men away from other employments. In Germany and France, on the other hand, the ranks of their armies are filled by conscription, and the merest pittance of pay, bearing but a slight relation to what he might earn in private employment, is allowed to the soldier. It would manifestly be absolutely impossible for either of these governments to maintain a standing army of anything like its present size upon a scale of payment to the soldier equal to that of the United States. On the other hand it would be equally impossible to induce the people of the United States to endure in time of peace such an enormous burden of expenditure as would be involved in the maintenance of a standing army equal to that of Germany or France, and paid at the same rate as our own soldiers are now paid. We thus see that the very form of government of the United States, involving voluntary enlistment and fair payment for military service, is a sufficient security from a financial standpoint alone, not to mention any others, against the maintenance of any large standing army. The more nearly the political institutions of other countries approach our democratic basis, the more difficult will it be found to appropriate the services of citizens without fair compensation, and to maintain the large standing armies which only compulsory military service render possible.

A still more striking illustration of the effect of the application of democratic ideas to military service is seen in the extraordinary growth of the pension system of this country. Between the close of the Civil War and the end of the last fiscal year the United States paid out in pensions to soldiers who have served in its armies the vast sum of \$1,588,000,000, which is equal to twenty-five per cent. of the whole cost of the Civil War, and to sixty per cent. of the total debt at the close of the war. The annual expenditure for pensions now amounts to at least \$150,000,000, and this sum is not likely to be materially reduced in the immediate future, while the annual payment of a very large sum will continue for a considerable period. This enormous expenditure for this purpose is entirely unique in the history of nations, and it clearly shows that the American people have deliberately adopted the doctrine that it is their duty, even at this great cost, incurred more than a quarter of a century after the restoration of peace, to endeavor to compensate veteran soldiers for the physical injuries sustained directly or indirectly through their service in war. Without pronouncing at this time

any judgment upon the wisdom or unwisdom of the liberal pension legislation of the United States, we may well take note of the new factor which it introduces into the problem of warfare. Following the same theory which leads us to secure soldiers for our standing army by the offer of pay rather than by conscription, we have recognized that physical injuries due to military service are the concern of the nation and not merely of the individual sufferer, and that a part at least of the decreased earning power resulting from them should be made up out of the public treasury. The result of this policy is that the United States is now paying out yearly for pensions a sum considerably greater than the annual cost of the army of Germany or of the army of France. That this constitutes an enormous addition to the cost of war is evident; it is equally clear that the necessity of incurring such a continuing expense should be, and is likely to be, a powerful influence in favor of the preservation of peace. War is becoming more and more a question of finance, and even the great expense imposed upon the tax-payers of the United States by its pension system may be worth all its costs by giving to the world the most striking object lesson of the real cost of war which it has ever had.

In spite of occasional exceptions, the people of the United States have recognized and sought to preserve the pacific character of their nation, and those who have controlled its foreign relations have generally endeavored to promote the peace of the world.

As early as the year 1787 the United States declared its reluctance to engage in war by inserting in a treaty with the Emperor of Morocco a clause providing that "if any differences shall arise by either party infringing on any of the articles of this treaty, peace and harmony shall remain notwithstanding in the fullest force until a friendly application shall be made for an arrangement, and until that application shall be rejected no appeal shall be made to arms." In nearly all its treaties with other Republics on the American continent, it is stipulated by the United States that war shall not be declared until the party considering itself offended shall have presented a statement of injuries or damages and demanded justice, and the same shall have been either refused or unreasonably delayed. A clause of a similar character is found in twenty-five treaties concluded by the United States with twenty-three different powers. The stipulation in the treaty between the United States and Mexico, concluded February 2, 1848, and subsequently re-affirmed by the treaty of December 30, 1853, is especially noteworthy for its breadth and comprehensiveness. The two countries engaged that resort shall not be had in any case to hostilities of any kind "until the government which deems itself aggrieved shall have naturally considered, in the spirit of peace and good neighborhood, whether it would not be better that such difference should be settled by the arbitration of commissioners appointed on each side, or by that of a friendly nation."

This brings us to the record of the United States in promoting international arbitration.

In the last twenty-five years this country, either through the President or through one of its foreign ministers, has successfully acted as arbitrator in seven cases of differences arising between other powers.

In 1869 Great Britain and Portugal submitted to the decision of the President of the United States their dispute over the ownership of the Island of Bulama on the west coast of Africa, and certain territory opposite to that island on the main land, and in the following year the President made an award in favor of Portugal.

In 1873 our minister at Rio Janeiro was appointed with the Italian minister to arbitrate the claim of a subject of Great Britain against Brazil, and the matter was settled by a considerable award in favor of the claimant.

In 1874 our minister at Rome was appointed to act as umpire in an arbitration of an old boundary dispute between Italy and Switzerland, and the arbitrators being unable to agree, the umpire rendered his decision in favor of Italy.

In 1875 our minister at Bogota, United States of Colombia, was appointed one of the arbitrators to settle a claim of an English subject against the government of that country, and the arbitrators agreed in a considerable award.

In 1878 a dispute between the Argentine Republic and Paraguay concerning the boundary line between the two countries was referred to the arbitration of the President of the United States, who rendered a decision in favor of Paraguay.

In 1888 Costa Rica and Nicaragua referred certain questions relating to a treaty between them to the President of the United States, and he rendered a decision settling the various points at issue.

In 1889 Brazil and the Argentine Republic signed a treaty referring a serious boundary dispute between them to the decision of the President of the United States. Various causes have delayed this arbitration, but the case is now ready to be laid before the President.

In two instances during this same period the United States has successfully mediated in disputes between foreign powers.

In 1871, when Spain was engaged in hostilities with the allied Republics of Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador and Peru, this government tendered its mediation, and by a treaty concluded at Washington brought about an indefinite armistice between the belligerent powers.

In 1881 a boundary dispute between the Argentine Republic and Chile, which had become so serious as to result in the suspension of diplomatic intercourse between the two countries, was settled

through the mediation of our respective ministers to those two countries.

We come now to the class of cases where this country has joined another country in providing for arbitration. Within the last century the United States has in thirty-three instances made agreements with other powers, nine of them being with Great Britain, for the settlement of disputed questions through some form of arbitration. Without undertaking any detailed examination of these cases it may be said in brief that many of them, involving questions of great delicacy and far reaching importance, or the payment of large sums of money, have resulted in arbitrations carried to a successful issue and effecting the permanent settlement of the questions involved. A few instances of such arbitrations may be briefly referred to, although they are well known.

The Jay Treaty negotiated with Great Britain in 1794, under the Presidency of George Washington, provided for the arbitration of boundary questions and other important points at issue between the two countries.

The treaty of peace with Great Britain concluded December 24, 1814, provided for the settlement of disputed boundary questions by boards of commissioners, the points at issue to be settled in case of the failure of the commissioners to agree by the decision of some friendly sovereign or State.

By the treaty with Great Britain of October 20, 1818, certain disputed questions were referred to the arbitration of the Emperor of Russia.

The Geneva arbitration in 1872 between the United States and Great Britain, with its award of \$15,000,000 damages to this country, is too well known to require more than a mere mention.

Under the same treaty another tribunal of arbitration in 1877 awarded to Great Britain the sum of \$5,500,000 for certain fishing privileges accorded to citizens of the United States, while in 1872 the Emperor of Germany rendered a decision in a boundary dispute on the northwest coast which the treaty had referred to his arbitration.

The present year has added to the list another conspicuous instance of successful arbitration between the same nations. By the public attention which it has attracted, the eminence of the counsel who have appeared before it, the novelty and importance of the questions of international law to be decided and by the whole character of the proceedings, the Behring Sea Tribunal has still further strengthened the cause of international arbitration.

While these instances alone would warrant the statement that it has now become the established policy of the United States and Great Britain to settle by arbitration questions arising between them which cannot be disposed of in the ordinary course of diplomacy the two nations have now committed themselves to this policy

by formal and specific declaration. In February, 1890, our Senate adopted the following resolution, introduced by Senator Sherman :

“Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be, and is hereby, requested to invite, from time to time as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any Government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two Governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peaceably adjusted by such means.”

This resolution was also adopted by the House of Representatives. On June sixteenth of this year a resolution was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Cremer, which after being amended by the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, was unanimously adopted. This resolution expressed the satisfaction with which the House of Commons had learned of the above resolution passed by the Congress of the United States and concluded as follows :

“And that this House, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that Her Majesty’s Government will lend their ready co-operation to the Government of the United States upon the basis of the foregoing resolution.”

Our ambassador at London, Mr. Bayard, in notifying the State Department of the passage of this resolution, having been himself present when it was adopted, writes, “The debate was participated in by the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, and many other members without regard to party affiliations, and was entirely above the usual range of ordinary Parliamentary expressions. . . . This debate and the adoption of the Resolution by the House, with the unanimous concurrence of all parties, is exceedingly encouraging to all who desire the substitution of reason for force in the arbitrament of international questions and as the proper basis of human government under all its conditions.”

Under instructions from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain the British Ambassador at Washington in communicating to the Government of the United States this resolution adopted by the House of Commons states that, “Her Majesty’s Government have pleasure in bringing these Resolutions to the knowledge of the Government of the United States.” Both of the great English-speaking nations have thus formally recognized the desirability of international arbitration, not only in special cases, but as a general principle of international relations. Without disparagement to the claims of other nations, I think that we may all agree that the first steps towards establishing international arbitration upon a solid and permanent basis cannot be more properly taken than by these two great countries united by a common blood and a common history, whose future interests lie so closely together, and which now include so large a portion of the

earth's surface and so great a number of its inhabitants beneath their flags.

MR. BONNEY: You will now have the rare pleasure of listening to the representatives from the different continents and very many countries in response to the sentiments which have been expressed in your hearing. Mr. Butterworth's delightful and charming poem, which cannot do otherwise than add greatly to his fame, this altogether splendid and able presentation of the actual and probable results of arbitration, as made by Mr. Quincy, could not be more properly followed than by the responses which you will now have the pleasure of hearing. The general secretary of this Congress is Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, Secretary of the American Peace Society, located at Boston. He is also chairman of the Committee on program and correspondence by which the program for this Congress was arranged. The presentation of the responses from the other continents and countries will be conducted by him.

I have the pleasure of presenting to you Dr. Trueblood.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Mr. Chairman — The oldest Peace Society in the World was founded in 1816 and has had connected with it during its long and useful history a number of the most prominent men in English politics, as Cobden, Bright and Henry Richard. We have with us to-night the Secretary of this old London Peace Society, and it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Dr. W. Evans Darby, who is so ably and industriously carrying forward the work inaugurated by his predecessors. Dr. Darby will respond for England.

DR. DARBY: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen — What shall a man say who cometh after the King? The able and statesmanlike address to which we have listened, marked by such intellectual acumen, such literary finish, such closely knit texture of thought and such political sagacity makes it difficult for any one to follow; and yet surely the very excellence of that address stirs our hearts and gives high promise of the proceedings of this Congress.

I imagine that all that is required of us who shall speak to you briefly to-night is just out of the fulness and spontaneity of our hearts to give the sentiments that are uppermost and to respond to the very generous words of welcome which have been spoken.

It gives me peculiar pleasure to occupy the position I do. Dr. Trueblood has told you that the society I have the honor to represent is the oldest peace society in the world. He has not told you, for of course in a few words he could not, how during the long lifetime of this society and the corresponding lifetime of the society that he represents these two organizations have been in the closest unity and correspondence, and have maintained almost perfect identity of aims; so much so that some of the

great movements in Europe that have been organized by the peace societies have been suggested by the society on this side of the water. Dr. Trueblood's predecessors have taken part in these movements and in more than one instance I believe have laid down their lives nobly in the furtherance of the aims of the two societies.

Now there is a larger bond of sympathy, it seems to me, between the people represented by the British Delegates and those who have welcomed them to-night. We too are the children of the Pilgrim Fathers, and the successors of the friends and followers of William Penn, and others whose services have gone to the making of this great Nation. We too share the great traditions of the past and our hearts beat high with the hopes of the future. We cordially grant all that our President has claimed for this great Nation, and we rejoice in the proud position that it occupies as one of the pioneers of the better age of the world when peace shall prevail throughout the whole human race. But you will notice that in that learned address our President just intimated that the old mother country and the daughter have been associated together in a peculiar way in this peace movement. Of the thirty-three instances in which the United States have been a party to successful arbitrations during the past century, thirty-three instances in which she has been associated with other nations in the application of the great principle we advocate, nine have been between the United States and the mother country. Sir, it seems to me that you, looking across the Atlantic, must wonder sometimes at the state of things visible in Europe. It seems as if militarism were growing year by year, and undoubtedly it is. There seems little hope for the better age of the world in the progress of the military establishments, in what one of our statesmen in Great Britain called the mad rivalry between the Nations of the European continent. There seems, I say, little hope for the future of the world in this wonderful development of military establishments, and of military necessities as some tell us, and yet ladies and gentlemen, believe me, that that is only one side of the condition of things, and if this were the occasion and the lateness of the hour did not forbid it, one might put before you another side which is full of inspiration and encouragement. Though the military establishments are being developed and the strain is great almost to the breaking point, there is a marvellous development of peace sentiment and peace principles. My co-delegates from the European continent could tell you of the development of that sentiment, and of the peace movement, even in France, Germany and Austria, and in all parts of the continent. That is another side that we shall endeavor to look at during the deliberations of our conference. Let us not grow pessimistic over the things that loom most largely in our vision. What we have to do, it seems to me, is to lay hold of the great principles of truth which should animate us in our work, and like the men who sailed westward in

the Mayflower set out on a new voyage towards a more glorious future.

Sir, it is a temptation to speak perhaps too long on an occasion like this. I will therefore simply express my cordial response to the hearty welcome which has been given us to-night. We shall carry back to our work in the old country a new inspiration from what we have seen and heard here; what we have seen of the wonderful development of your country, of that great life which is throbbing in this far West and which becomes visible not only in the White City on the Lake, but in the older city where the currents of commerce run so free and strong.

While we are deliberating together and looking forward to the future, let us remember what your poet Whittier has told us :

“God works in all things, all obey
His first propulsion from the night.
Wake thou and watch, the world is gray
With morning light.”

Mr. Quincy to-night has told us in forms of speech such as becomes a statesman, as he proves himself to be, how this great cause of humanity has received its first propulsion from the night. Already, if we will listen, we shall hear some echo of the old song of the angels, and if we will look with wide open eyes we shall see too amongst this great commercial life and on the highways of toil, as the poet of this evening has told us, emblems of God, expressions of the great love which shall work its way out through all the mistakes and animosities and strifes of men to the glorious era of brotherhood and universal love and the one government and kingdom under which all men shall realize the blessing of righteousness, peace and joy. Heartily do I respond to your welcome this evening. (Applause.)

DR. TRUEBLOOD: The African Congress on the other side of the partition in the Hall of Columbus stole some of our audience to-night, but they did not get the Prince, and we will now introduce to you Prince Momolu Massaquoi, who comes from one of the western nations of Africa and is now studying in this country.

PRINCE MASSAQUOI: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—I have been very much interested in listening to the eloquent addresses of the gentlemen who have preceded me. I have within the last few months learned to appreciate the word “peace” as I have never before appreciated it. About six or seven months ago our people in Africa had a misunderstanding with another tribe, something which you know always results in war there. Every two hundred miles in Africa will take you to a distinct tribe in language and customs and religion and other characteristics, and the least insult from one to another results in war and many lives are lost and many are taken into captivity.

About seven months ago, our people engaged in frightful battles in West Africa. The whole territory was devastated. Many of my people were taken into captivity; some were killed; my own mother fled from the city and for eleven days she was in the forest. When she was found she was almost starved and a few days afterwards died. At that time I was attending one of the institutions of this country. I was sent for by my friends to come immediately back and relieve my people, and when I saw them I said to myself, henceforth I shall have no use for war. Of course I have never had any use for it before, but I shall not even read about war. Before that, I had been greatly interested in the life of Napoleon. As I saw that man of destiny with his sword in his hand sweep all Europe almost, I would nearly jump from my seat. When I went home to my own country and saw these people, the babies, little boys and girls, just like dead frogs, in the most pitiable condition, you may believe I had no further heart to read of war. Some of them died of starvation before my eyes, and grown men — I could count every bone in their bodies. I could look upon a man's head and see the distinct partitions of every bone of his skull. I have often heard the expression "starve to death," but I never had seen people actually starve until I went home this time and saw that miserable condition of my people.

There is another thing that I would like to mention which will be perhaps more interesting to you. What I have related to you was done by savage people, people who knew no better. They believe somebody made them, but they don't know who He is, nor how to approach Him, and worship Him. The thing to ask is this (and I am glad I am speaking before England, Germany and the great nations of this earth): What is the outlook of European colonization in Africa? The very war which I have related to you was caused by the liquor traffic. The European nations are taking liquor into that country and after these people drink the liquor they at once go to war. Take the most intelligent man in this audience and let him take a glass of whiskey and he will strike any man that comes along. If that is true of civilized men, you may be sure it is true of uncivilized people. We read the history of colonization and we see how different nations have contended for territory, and even in the history of this very country we see that when the Europeans first came to colonize it they went right to fighting. England and France got into a contest and we had the great French and Indian war and other minor contests that I do not recall. I was interested to hear that there was something in the world by the name of "peace." I never knew that such a society existed. I am glad this thing is before the people and that people have come from all parts of the world to interest themselves in this matter, but my people will never know peace as long as America or Europe sends liquor into that country. I would welcome all the Christian nations to Africa for

the improvement of the country, but not to go with oppression and the sword.

I thank you very kindly for the greeting you have extended. I did not know that I would be before you as a speaker. I simply thought I would be introduced to the audience as one who came from Africa, but having heard these excellent speeches I was somewhat animated to tell you the condition of my people. I thank you very much for the greetings you have extended us and thank the President for the invitation given me to speak to you.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: You will now have the great satisfaction of listening to a speech in that noble German language by Dr. Adolph Richter, who comes as delegate from the General German Peace Society, and will respond for Germany.

Dr. Richter addressed the Congress in German, which was translated in substance by Dr. Trueblood, as follows:

Dr. Richter regrets that he cannot speak in English, the language of the Congress, and returns the greetings that have been so kindly extended to Germany and other nations. He speaks of the encouraging growth of peace sentiment and of peace societies in Germany, the land of militarism. He refers to the Exposition and the manner in which it has shown the industrial progress of the world and how this great gathering of people from all nations will promote the peace of the world. Then he refers to the duty of the peace societies of urging the carrying out of this work of peace-making through the channels of commerce, of trade, of literature, and in all the ways which we have represented in this great World's Exposition. He says that the political institutions of our country not only represent a new idea and constitute a new nation but they indicate a new time, a new age of the world, and he hopes that the influence of the United States may be world-wide, and that other nations may come to enjoy like political privileges and the peace which results therefrom.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I had hoped that we should have a representative here to-night to speak for France, the other nation of militarism, but no delegate has yet arrived from that country.

I will next introduce to you a lady whom I am sure you will be glad to hear. Some three years ago there was formed a peace society in Austria which has grown until it now has more than 3000 members. We had greatly hoped to see the founder of this society, the Baroness Von Suttner, at this Congress, but her health and her duties in Europe kept her away. The Society is represented here by Madame Wisinger who will now respond for Austria, bringing the greetings of the Baroness Von Suttner and of the Austrian Peace Society.

MADAME WISINGER: Mr. President, Gentlemen and Ladies — It gives me much pleasure, on this first visit to your great coun-

try, to come as a delegate in such a good and humane cause as that of Peace. I am here, virtually, as the representative of my honored friend and colleague, the Baroness Von Suttner; and in that capacity, and in her name, I present you the greetings of the Austrian Peace Societies.

It seems to me significant, almost an omen, I may say, that we come first on the list of the Congress, though we are the last, and therefore, in some senses, the least of Peace Societies. Our origin is only of yesterday, and we have not yet had an opportunity of showing to what proportions our work may grow. Already, however, considerable progress has been made. The Austrian Peace Society was formed in the year 1891 immediately before the Congress at Rome mainly through the efforts of my friend, the Baroness Von Suttner; and now it has two children, so that to-day we have three Peace Societies in Vienna.

The differences in the character of these Societies are indicative of the varied nature of our Peace work in Austria.

First there is the general society, of which the Baroness is President, composed of all classes of the community, from the Prince Wrede, who is one of our Vice-Presidents, downwards. The second, formed also through the earnest work and eloquent advocacy of our President, is the University Peace Society, whose membership is confined to the University Students, a class of young men who will be the guides and leaders of public thought and action in the future.

And, just two months before I left home, a third society was formed, called the Literary Peace Society, which, as the name indicates, belongs to the intellectual and literary classes, the circles of light and leading, in our Metropolis.

The promise of our Peace movement is greater because of this diversity. Some account must be taken of the quality as well as numbers of our membership. For if the titled classes, the thoughtful and literary sections of society, and our academic youth, as well as the general public, be all ranged under the same banner, and combine their energies in the same good cause, the result is likely to be greater than if it were confined to one class or one section only.

Nor must it be forgotten that our Peace principles have spread extensively in parliamentary circles. In our Reichsrath we have a large contingent of the Interparliamentary Conference, and these members of our parliament are among the most active and steadfast of our adherents. The cause which is taken up and earnestly supported by such eminently practical and common-sense men as Members of Parliament are supposed to be can no longer be considered visionary and theoretic only.

The Baroness Von Suttner wishes me to express to you, on her behalf, her very great regret at being unable to be present at the

meetings of the Fifth Universal Peace Congress in Chicago. She desires me, also, to say to you how heartily she is in sympathy with all who are engaged in our common work, and how ardently she desires the success of the meetings of this Congress. She will be present at all of them in spirit and sympathy.

She and all those who are associated with her in the work in Austria will follow all our proceedings with interest, and doubtless will be stimulated to fresh and patient effort by what is done this week by us here.

For myself I can only say that my presence here testifies to my devotion to the cause and to my anxiety to have some share in both its toils and its triumphs. I hope that our deliberations will be marked by cordiality and unanimity; and that our intercourse will do more than our mere discussions by promoting that spirit of good will and solidarity which will be the soul and strength of our movement.

May I also fervently express the hope, as I entertain the belief, that the day is not far distant when our views shall carry the convictions of all who are thoughtful and sincere and when peace shall reign unbroken over the whole world.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: We are pleased to have present with us to-night a gentleman from the antipodes, and I am sure you will be glad to listen to a few remarks from the royal Commissioner to the World's Fair from China, Mr. Pung. He will speak in Chinese and his translator will give the substance in English.

The interpreter said: Mr. Pung says it is the object of this Congress, as we understand, to secure the adoption of pacific measures for the settlement of international difficulties, and there is practically no nation on the surface of the globe that appreciates the value of peace as much as China, insomuch as China has passed through crises very similar to those that Europe passed through during the Napoleonic wars.

It must be remembered that centuries before the advent of the Prince of Peace upon earth Confucius inculcated the brotherhood of man, and it is evident that China is a country that is peaceful by policy as well as by tradition.

In thus expressing our own sympathies for the object of this Congress we think that we voice practically the sentiment of the Chinese nation as a whole.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I will next ask Signor Patrizi to speak for Italy, another one of the great countries of Europe. He will speak in English. Mr. Patrizi represents the Lombard Union of the International Peace Association, of which our distinguished friend Mr. Moneta is President. Mr. Moneta greatly regrets that he could not be present himself to bring the greetings of the Society, but he has delegated Mr. Patrizi to do so.

SIGNOR PATRIZI: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen — Italy, the country of Columbus, the most recently organized of the nations of Europe, sends its fraternal greetings to the great, prosperous and civilized country of the new world, the United States of America.

The city of Milan joins in sending a special salutation to the sister city of Chicago, which has been able to realize the greatest feature of international peace, the World's Fair.

All of my colleagues of the International Peace Society of Milan send to you, gentlemen, representatives of the most civilized country, the expression of their sympathies and solidarity with you in our mutual humane work of peace.

I am proud to be the bearer of these greetings, all the more as I am the youngest member of the Board of Directors of the Unione Lombarda, inasmuch as I have often heard that the youngest ones love war while those among them who dislike it and hate it are considered timid.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I must frankly say that I am proud to stand in this Congress by such men as Charles C. Bonney, Thomas Bryan and Benjamin F. Trueblood. I am proud to hear myself called timid when I see displayed in front of me an ideal so great as that of peace and human brotherhood.

No, not even the youngest ones should want War! Have they not already the bitter struggle for life to care for? And is there not a province where every one can try his energy, the great field of work and industry? I firmly believe that from this Congress will come forth propositions enabling us to more widely extend our propaganda. But allow me to express this opinion of mine: I think that our Congress is the noble complement of that most pacific and important Congress, the great Exposition, which is the true and real Congress of Peace because it is a congress of labor. It is here that the citizens of all the world have had the opportunity to meet and shake hands in the name of civilization and progress. It is here that every day I see floating in the breeze of Lake Michigan thousands of flags that at Chicago to-day represent the peace and the fraternity of the civilized nations.

I have repeatedly heard the unjust accusation that peace is a cause of weakness and final demoralization of human energy. Well, it is now nearly thirty years that peace has reigned in this glorious American union, and yet the United States are to-day at the head of the civil movement of the world, and their cities are celebrated for wonderful works, their immense plains crossed by 193,000 miles of railways, distributing knowledge and progress everywhere where there are Americans, the people that has made in the face of the wide world one of the grandest of achievements, this Exposition, which is the greatest enterprise of its kind ever known. All these are the arguments demonstrating that peace

does not foster demoralization and weakness among nations, but on the contrary gives birth to their greatness and prosperity.

If Europe does not soon decide upon a general disarmament and the transformation of the steel of their guns and ironclads into instruments of labor, and the transformation into laborers of those human machines, as soldiers have been called by General Turenne, it will undoubtedly soon go to utter ruin; while America, walking steadily on this way of peace and labor, will reach untold greatness and glory.

You Americans are free from that fearful destroyer of national wealth, "a standing army." You that have sowed broadcast from the Atlantic to the Pacific the conceptions of your country are teaching us the most practical and useful means of propaganda and the means of reaching most quickly this common ideal.

Meanwhile, let me give you the assurance that we Europeans, when we return to our country, will do all in our power to properly profit by the results of this Congress to educate the popular conscience to its civic duties, so that when human consciences shall be educated to the true conception of peace and human brotherhood they may form an impregnable defensive wall against which all tyrannies and governmental greed of power and glory will come to their end.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: We are much pleased to have an eastern lady with us, who comes from Turkey and will respond for that country. Madam Korana of Beyrout will now address you.

MADAM KORANA: Mr. President, Gentlemen and Ladies — It gives me the greatest pleasure and honor to stand here an Oriental woman to give response to the greetings of the Congress of peace. Though history does not give us the credit of being a peaceful nation in the past, our people are now lovers of peace. When two of our nation meet the salutation is "peace be with you." Though we do not have a formal organization of peace, this simple greeting, I think, shows a universal organization; it shows that our people love peace and hate war. I think that Providence reserved this New World to give it to mankind when they needed a proclamation of peace and I hope that this World's Fair will end in a great International organization which shall proclaim peace, charity and love to the whole world. (Applause.)

DR. TRUEBLOOD: We had hoped to have present to-night a representative from Switzerland, but I do not know that Mr. John Clerc who has been sent as a delegate from the Swiss Society has yet arrived. I will ask Mr. Mueller from Sweden to speak for the Swedish Peace Society. Mr. Mueller has been in England a good deal and will reply in English as he speaks the language very well; Dr. Mueller also comes as a delegate from the Danish Society.

MR. MUELLER: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen — It gives me great pleasure to come to you as a bearer of greetings from Sweden. I ought to say that the gentleman who was to be here from Denmark regretted very much that he could not be with us. He is one of the most active men in this movement and has been a military man. I mean by a military man one who knows something about war. It is generally those who have been military men who make the best peace men, when they are convinced of the wrong of war.

Sweden is one of the later countries that have entered into this peace movement. Mr. Arnoldson, a former member of the Swedish Parliament, commenced to work for the peace movement in Sweden about eight years ago. He received nothing but abuse among his own friends, as well as among strangers and from the press. He then started a paper of his own chiefly for the purpose of propagating these views that he held. Little by little he organized societies and there are now, after about eight years, forty-three societies in Sweden with a central committee in Stockholm, and there are members as far north as seventy degrees north latitude, where perpetual snow and ice are found. These forty-three societies have about three thousand active members, active in every sense of the word.

In Sweden, as you perhaps know, the people are very different from the American people. They act slowly.

In America everything goes fast, but in Europe and especially in Sweden everything moves very slowly. The people do not make many movements unless they are fully convinced as to what they are doing.

Excuse me if I make a personal remark. I have not come to the World's Exposition. Of course while I am here in Chicago it would be very foolish for me not to see this World's Fair, but there is something far more important than the World's Fair. I think first of all we must have order in the world and order cannot exist as long as war exists. I hold that the peace movement is far more important than this World's Fair which represents so many millions of capital. It is true we are small societies, but never mind about that. There was a time when a few men began in Boston on slavery. They hardly had courage enough to work openly at first because they were ridiculed. How is it to-day? Slavery is abolished and people wonder how it could have existed so long.

There are very likely others here from long distances who wish to speak to you and have much to communicate to you about their movements and their country. I will simply say that we fully appreciate the words of our President this evening and I wish to say that these forty-three societies in Sweden and about the same number in Denmark send you their hearty greetings, and though there is very much salt water between them and you

which prevents many from being with you this evening, be assured of their sympathy to the fullest extent. They are longing to hear the result of our work during this meeting.

I thank you very much.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Kindly wait for one more speech, by a lady. Little Denmark, surrounded by the seas, has now to bring its greetings to the Peace Congress of Chicago in the person of Madam Nico Beck Meyer who will be the last speaker of the evening.

MADAM MEYER: When the gentleman from Germany was speaking in his mother tongue, I noticed many faces beam with pleasure. I fear if I should commence to speak in my mother tongue there would not be many faces beam with pleasure, so I shall try the English tongue.

I wish briefly to bring the greetings from our forty-two peace societies with thousands of members, grown up in five or six years in Denmark. They wish to bring to you their heartfelt wish for success during this Congress.

I do believe in the World's Fair, for if we look at the work out there we look at the peace movement at the same time, and I hope that the work that is done here will advance our cause and I hope all who are here to-night will to-morrow bring their brothers and cousins so that this hall may be filled up, and that we shall not go to work with empty chairs.

PRESIDENT BONNEY: The future sessions of this Congress on Arbitration and Peace will be presided over by the Honorable Josiah Quincy, permanent President of the Congress. The proceedings of this opening meeting are concluded.

SECOND SESSION.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15TH, 10 A. M.

The Congress reassembled in the Hall of Columbus, with Hon. Josiah Quincy, the President, in the Chair.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. William G. Hubbard, of Columbus, Ohio.

The Secretary of the Congress then read the following letters and parts of letters from various persons unable to be present.

Sir Joseph Pease, President of the London Peace Society :

MY DEAR FRIEND — I am in receipt of your letter of the seventeenth, and I beg you will convey to the Committee of the Chicago Peace Congress my sincere thanks for the honor they have done me in electing me as one of the Vice-Presidents of the Congress to be held on August fourteenth and following days.

I have watched with interest and great satisfaction the efforts that are being made to take advantage of the Chicago Exhibition to promote the cause of Peace and Unity among nations, and no more suitable opportunity than this could be found for a great Congress of the peoples of the world such as you describe.

I very much regret that there is no possibility of my coming to Chicago this year. It is doubtful whether the present session of Parliament will have come to an end by the fourteenth of August, and in any event my engagements here are so numerous that I cannot see my way to leaving home at the time.

Had it been in my power nothing would have given me greater pleasure than to be present, and to add my testimony as President of the English Peace Society to what I believe is the great and growing feeling in favor of the movement. Everything that tends to destroy prejudices, and to bring about a better understanding and a closer sympathy between nations, especially those speaking the same language and sprung from the same stock, must be of the greatest service to our cause. Humanity, morality and religion are on our side, and of its ultimate success I entertain no doubt.

Björnstjörne Björnson, Aulestad, Norway :

DEAR SIR — I regret not being able to meet the friends of peace at the Arbitration and Peace Congress. Allow me to send my respectful greetings and best wishes to the members of the Con-

gress, and to remind them that, politics being the daughter of war, our party struggles still retain too much of the morality of war and methods of war.

I hold it the duty of every friend of peace to combat the false morality of war in our internal struggles for right. Politics should be the highest form of love of our neighbor, and the political discussions ought to bear witness of this love.

The inherited bias of our minds to carry everything to its utmost point, and to use whatever means give promise of victory, must be transformed into a will-power directed towards attaining the best possible ends by the best possible means.

If we can extinguish that passion of hatred and greediness of victory which burn in our civil struggles, then and not till then shall we gain such a power of persuasion as will extinguish the passion of war itself.

Bishop of Durham, Bishop Auckland, England :

MY DEAR SIR — I regret that my engagements make it impossible for me to accept the invitation with which you have honored me. Let me however wish every blessing on the labors of your conference. If it brings Americans and Englishmen to closer friendship the whole world will rejoice.

Hodgson Pratt, President International Arbitration and Peace Association, London :

DEAR DR. TRUEBLOOD — It is with extreme regret that I find myself obliged to abandon my intention of going to Chicago.

For years I have desired both on public and personal grounds to visit the States ; and the occasion of the Peace Congress has made that desire very intense indeed. My disappointment is proportionally great. I heartily pray that your meetings may be attended with great success.

Percy L. Parker, for Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, London :

DEAR SIR — Mr. Price Hughes wishes me to say that if it had been possible for him to have visited America this year, nothing would have given him greater happiness than to accept the invitation with which you honor him.

I need scarcely say that he has the deepest sympathy with the Peace movement and that of late he has very frequently both in London and on provincial platforms advocated a permanent treaty of Arbitration between England and the United States. You will be glad to learn that nothing he ever says is received with more boundless enthusiasm by great representative gatherings of English people in every part of the kingdom.

Thomas Snape, M. P., London :

MY DEAR DR. TRUEBLOOD — It is scarcely probable that our Parliamentary duties will admit of my leaving England in time to be in Chicago when the Congress meets.

I hope the result of the Congress will be to give a resistless impulse to the establishment of International Arbitration and Peace throughout the civilized world.

Will you convey to the Congress the expression of my deep regret that I am unable to attend, the assurance of my most ardent sympathy with its aim, and of my earnest prayer for the success of the object it meets to promote.

Greetings were also received from Andrew Carnegie, Philip Stanhope, M.P., Fredrik Bajer, J. Dumas, E. T. Moneta, A. Mazzoleni, Elie Ducommun, John B. Wood and N. L. Upham. Cablegrams of greeting were read from the Wisbech Peace Society, the Liverpool Peace Society, and from Messrs. Arnaud and Montluc of the International League of Peace and Liberty.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: In receiving the representatives of different nations last night, we did not hear from Switzerland. This morning a gentleman representing Switzerland is present. Mr. John Clerc will now present the greetings of that country. He speaks French better than English and I will translate for you the substance of what he says. Mr. Clerc represents the Swiss branch of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, and also represents personally the Secretary of the International Peace Bureau, Mr. Elie Ducommun. I should not omit to say that Mr. Clerc is a member of the Swiss Parliament.

Mr. Clerc then addressed the Congress in French, the substance of which was interpreted as follows:

Mr. Clerc regrets that he has to speak in any other language than that used in the Congress. He presents the salutations of the little old Republic of Switzerland to the great Republic of the United States. He is also very happy to be present in a Congress gathered for the promotion of peace, for the hastening of the day when war shall be done away and peace shall reign. In bringing these salutations he has the great pleasure of presenting to the Congress this white-bordered Swiss flag, the emblem of peace, sent by the friends of peace in Switzerland, and also the Austrian flag, sent by the Austrian Peace Society.

We are very glad to welcome Mr. Clerc to this country and to our Congress. The white-bordered flag is intended to teach peace and good-will — that there is something larger and more beautiful than nationality, that is, inter-nationality, the great union of the world. (Applause.) It is not intended to destroy nationality at all, but to show that all nations are to be brought together in peace and harmony. The lady who presented the first white-bordered flag at the Congress at Rome is to present it here in a day or two, and I will not spoil her speech by saying more.

THE CHAIRMAN : The first on the program this morning is a poem by Miss Maria Louise Eve of Augusta, Georgia, "Peace to the World," which I shall call upon the Secretary to read, as Miss Eve is absent.

The Secretary then read the poem as follows :

PEACE TO THE WORLD.

Peace to the world,
And war-flags furled !
Ring out the bells in every land,
For in a council, sweet and grand,
The nations come in common cause,
To ask for wiser, better laws.
To curb the passions, fierce and strong,
That work so much of ruth and wrong,
The cruel hand of war to stay,
And show a nobler, better way.

Peace to the world,
And war-flags furled !
To these new shores, long past, there came
A man who bore a strange sweet name,
Columbus (Dove), from God's own hand,
With olive-branch, in quest of land;
Yea, Christopher (Christ-bearing) came; —
Came, with his quaint, prophetic name,
Divinely sent, on tireless wing,
Across the waste, our Peace to bring.

War in the world,
With flags unfurled !
Four hundred years of woe and weal,
Since rested on these shores the keel
That bore the Christ, whose "Peace," of old,
The warring winds and waves controlled;
To hearts of men, He spake His "Peace,"
And yet the warring did not cease,
For winds and waves are gentler far
Than human hearts inflamed with war.

War in the world,
With flags unfurled !
For still they fought and still they slew,
As if no other way they knew,

And earth's fair bosom drenched with red
 Of wasted life, untimely shed.
 Were right and reason all unknown?
 Alas, where had sweet pity flown,
 That hearts of men so hard should be,
 So full of hate and cruelty?

Peace in the world,
 With flags unfurled!
 When swords no more, as it hath been,
 Are arbiters 'twixt men and men,
 But fellowmen, the wise and great,
 In council sweet shall arbitrate.
 The world will turn a brighter page,
 And enter on her golden age,
 When wasting wars forever cease,
 And all her arts are arts of peace.

Peace in the world,
 With flags unfurled!
 Thrice welcome, this Columbian year,
 Ye comrades in a cause so dear!
 Thrice welcome to the trysting-place,
 Where nations meet in fond embrace.
 And in a compact sweet and strong,
 Resolve to labor, late and long,
 Till every land shall bolt and bar,
 Against the grim old tyrant, war.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next of our papers is on "The Origin, Principles and Purposes of Peace Societies," by W. Evans Darby, LL.D., Secretary of the English Peace Society of London.

DR. DARBY then read the following paper :

ORIGIN OF PEACE SOCIETIES, PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES OF THEIR FORMATION.

"The finger of God in history," as Bunsen expresses it—the presence of a Divine Agent active in human affairs, and prompting and directing human thoughts and purposes, is singularly illustrated in the origin of the earliest Peace Societies, and in the absolute identity of the principles and purposes of their formation.

In no other way can the fact be adequately accounted for, that within a period of ten months, at the beginning of the present century, four distinct organizations came into existence, in regions far distant from each other, indeed in different hemispheres, embodying the same conceptions, aims and purposes, without any

communication with each other, and, so far as can be ascertained, wholly unconscious of each others' existence, and without the knowledge that any other Peace Society had been contemplated.

The modern peace movement had birth as have the rivers of this great continent. The rain and dew of Divine suggestion fell, simultaneously, on both sides of the Atlantic and condensed into distinct organization and effort, into streams which are still fresh and vigorous and which, mingled with later-born streams of effort and influence, form the Universal Peace Congresses of to-day.

It will be my purpose to trace briefly the rise and flow of these various streams.

Two lines of Divine suggestion are distinctly traceable at the beginning of the century in England and America, which though very similar, in fact so like each other as to be almost identical, were yet distinct, and wholly independent. The idea had its origination in the human side of things. It had also its human embodiments and exponents, of course; and when once the sentiment had been awakened, the pressure of personal conviction and the need for concerted action did the rest. None the less was it divine in its inception and development.

The long European war, described by Lord Russell as "the most bloody hostilities that ever mangled the face of Europe," had directed the attention of thoughtful public men to the real nature of war and the attitude towards it of the Christian Churches. And the war of 1812-1814, between America and the mother country, quickened a similar sentiment on this side the Atlantic, and brought the leading thinkers of both nations, themselves altogether unconscious of the fact, into full accord with each other. Dr. Channing and Dr. Noah Worcester in America, Dr. Chalmers, David Bogue and others in Great Britain, were advocating the same principles and purposes without any concert whatever, and in total ignorance of each other and of the extent of that peace sentiment springing up around them, which was shortly to crystallize into distinct and visible forms. This Divine Origin of the movement is the more distinctly seen as it is studied in detail, and the fact transpires, that those who were originating the movement in various districts of the same land were ignorant of what the others were attempting and fondly fancied that their own efforts were the first of the kind. Thus the twenty persons who organized the New York Peace Society "did not know that any other Peace Society had been contemplated;" and, barely three months later, the Ohio Peace Society was founded by some gentlemen "who supposed their Society was the first of the kind." So with the others. They obeyed the secret suggestion and prompting of God who was behind them.

The first distinct beginning of that condensation of sentiment and idea which was shortly to run in form of action, dates as early as the year 1804. In that year a merchant of the city of New

York, a Presbyterian by ecclesiastical profession, had his attention called to the question of Peace and War, and began to read up on the subject avoiding all books of the Society of Friends against whom he was strongly prejudiced. After five years' mature deliberation he gave the results of his studies to the public in the form of a tract which he entitled, "The Mediator's Kingdom not of this World." The publication attracted some attention and called forth a reply — the joint work of three literary men — one a clergyman — entitled, "The Duty of a Christian in a Trying Situation."

A rejoinder followed. The controversy began to excite public opinion. The New York merchant, impelled by the fervor of a new faith and of a strong conviction, labored incessantly among his friends and acquaintances, a few of whom at length openly avowed the pacific principles which he had taught.

This was the actual beginning. As early as 1810, some friends of the new cause deliberated together on the expediency of forming a Peace Society, but the war with Great Britain was so threatening that it was judged inexpedient then.

That war took place, with what results is altogether outside this inquiry. Meanwhile the New York merchant, like the old Hebrew, consumed by the word of the Lord, which was as a "fire in his bones," would not let the matter rest. Again he wrote a treatise entitled, "War inconsistent with the religion of Jesus Christ" which was published early in 1815. War having now ended in both continents, the friends of peace resumed their deliberations, and, in the August following, the New York Peace Society was organized. This, in order of time, is the first Peace Society in the world, and it is worth noting that like the other Peace Societies of this period it embraced "men of all sects, denominations and parties."

While this spirit was working in New York, "like the leaven hid in the meal," a kindred spirit was active in Massachusetts. The course of the movement was the same. Enquiry resulted in the publishing of Dr. Noah Worcester's tract entitled, "A Solemn Review of the Custom of War," on Christmas day of 1814. It was extensively read, carried conviction to the minds of its readers; and, on the 26th of December, 1815, the constitution of the Massachusetts Peace Society was signed by twenty-two members.

Three weeks earlier — on the second of December, 1815, had been formed the Ohio Peace Society, by some gentlemen who had read the "Solemn Review," — the same who "supposed that their Society was the first of the kind."

Turning to the other stream of the movement: — How early the formation of Peace Societies in Great Britain was contemplated it is impossible to say. But in July, 1815, the proposal was published in a periodical called the "Philanthropist." It was contained in a letter to the Editor, written the previous April, proba-

bly before Dr. Worcester's "Solemn Review" had been seen in that country.

Action had been already taken, however. As early as 1814, Mr. William Allen, a philanthropic gentleman in London belonging to the Society of Friends, invited several gentlemen to meet at his house in Plough Court to consider the expediency of forming a Peace Society. There was absolute unanimity of sentiment on that point and a committee was formed; but there were difficulties in the way of immediate action. No specific plan of action had been arranged and so the gentlemen present undertook to communicate their views to Mr. Allen. A year passed, during which the matter was allowed to lie dormant. On the 6th of June, 1815, another meeting was held. But it was only a few days before the battle of Waterloo. The time was not ripe. Only three members attended. They adopted a resolution defining the objects of the proposed Society, and separated. Nearly another year passed. On the 1st of June, 1816, Mr. Allen again summoned the Committee. Now there was a large attendance, and the members were eager for progress. A Committee was formed to complete the organization of the Society and a day in the following week, the 7th of June, was fixed on for this purpose. It met as arranged. In the interim, information had been received of the establishment of the Massachusetts Peace Society and this had a considerable effect on the proceedings of the day. The foremost had their ardor increased, the laggards were stimulated and in the following week, on the 14th of June (1816), four days before the first anniversary of Waterloo, was formed the Society for the promotion of permanent and universal Peace.

The history and work of the Peace Societies in America will be dealt with in another paper, and by an abler hand. I need only notice, therefore, that the movement in America developed with such rapidity that the whole number of Peace Societies in the United States probably exceeded fifty, many of which had been recently formed, when the National Society, the American Peace Society, I mean, was organized at New York on the 8th of May, 1828.

The development of the movement was equally rapid in Great Britain, until the United Kingdom was covered with a net work of societies—in Scotland, Ireland, Wales and the Channel Islands as well as England, and even in Nova Scotia and Canada. As, however, these were all branches of the one organization, the Peace Society, the history of their formation would be only the history of its development, which is beyond the scope of this paper, dealing only as it does with origins.

In France also as the result of the labors of the Peace Society a similar organization was formed, and as the political situation did not admit of its being called a Peace Society, it was entitled *La Société de la morale Chrétienne*, The Society of Christian

Morals. It published its prospectus on the 16th of August, 1821, and declared its object to be, "to dispose mankind to abjure all anger, all hatred, all unhappy dissension — to love one another — to treat each other as brethren and finally to seek and procure peace."

You will perceive that without mentioning the words Christian or religious, for which caution the religious condition of France furnished probably as strong reasons as the political, its principles and purposes, as also its broad, and free, and unsectarian membership, were identical with those of the parent and sister societies. The distinguishing feature of these societies was their religious and yet their absolutely unsectarian basis and character. Not that they were less practical or even less political on that account, as their history shows, but they abjured party politics, making their own principles of Peace the differentiating force of parties, and they believe that religion (by which they meant the Christianity of Christ, i.e., of the primitive and pre-Constantine period) was the only practical means of procuring and preserving peace.

The declaration of the American Peace Society, issued on the occasion of its formation in 1828, admirably expresses the fundamental position of all. It says among other things :

"We believe the customs of war to be contrary to the principles of the Christian religion, subversive of the liberty of mankind, and destructive to their happiness; a horrible custom, which every one is called upon to do what he can to abolish. These truths we hold to be undisputed, and they are the foundation of our Society. Nevertheless, we draw no dividing or distinguishing line. We do not, as a society, agitate the question, whether defensive war can be carried on on Christian principles. We receive into our communion all who seek the abolition of war, whether they hold to the lawfulness of defensive war, or condemn all war in every shape — whether they allow a latitude of construction to the injunctions of our Saviour, or take the exact and strict letter of them. We endeavor to avoid all "doubtful disputations," and to walk peacefully with all who will walk with us, whether they go further, or not so far, as the majority of the society; and we open the columns of our periodical publications to all who choose, fairly and candidly to investigate the subject of defensive war, but hold ourselves responsible for nothing which appears in our pages, which is not expressly authorized by this board. This we do the more readily, as we believe that public opinion, when rightly directed, is able to abolish all wars of aggression, and that will put an end to all controversy respecting defensive war, which we do not even attempt to define, for to define would be to decide.

"Tamerlane and Napoleon called their wars defensive, and all conquerors from the one to the other, have done the same. Such

defensive wars we condemn. When we shall hear of a nation's waging defensive war without committing aggression, we may, perhaps, withhold our censure; and when we shall see a defensive war carried on on Christian principles, we shall certainly approve of it. We will also allow Christianity of every sect, to use their own peculiar modes of expression in their discussions, but we will not allow our publications to be the vehicle of the peculiar doctrines of any sect, or the arena on which polemic theologians may contend for victory; for as a society, whatever may be the opinion of individual members, we shall confine ourselves to the pacific precepts of Christ, our divine founder, and avoid all strife of every kind. We are not confined to any sect or denomination of Christians, but ask the countenance, the encouragement and the support of all. Neither have we anything to do with the fluctuating politics of the day. Our principles were promulgated by the song of angels, which proclaimed peace on earth, and good will to man; they soar far above the temporary and local affairs of States and Empires; they are as extensive as the world and lasting as eternity. Wherever breathes a human soul we hail him brother. Whatever may be the color of his skin, or the articles of his creed, we delight to do him good, and to extend to him the peaceful principles of our blessed Saviour. We are not confined by geographical boundaries, natural or artificial, but seek 'the greatest good of the greatest number.'

Another declaration says:

"The Peace Society is founded solely on the Christian religion, and is entirely distinct from all political considerations. In promulgating the principles of the utter unlawfulness of war, we equally embrace that of perfect non-resistance to all the lawful commands of government, and in refusing to comply with the unlawful command to fight, it is in obedience to the superior will of Him who is above all principalities and powers. It is our duty to obey the commands of the Almighty before those of man. We are told to honor the King but we are first commanded to 'fear God.' If the will of a king be opposed to the commands of his Creator his subjects are justified in refusing to comply with them, and are free from all crime of rebellion. In defence of the pacific principles our great magazine of arguments is the Bible, to which we refer against every battery that can be levelled against them.

"We sometimes have recourse to human arguments such as the crimes occasioned by war, the insufficiency of war to attain its intended objects, the great predominancy of evil over good in all wars, etc. But these are mere light words when compared with the evidences of divine truth; they may strengthen and corroborate the effects produced by reading the testamental law of Christ, but they will produce no beneficial and permanent effects where those laws fail."

It was a grand program and faithfully has it been followed.

Utopian, if you will ! But it is an Utopianism that carries with it the hope of human society, and the principles it avows lie behind all mere methods and instruments for procuring and preserving peace. It has not been supplanted or even supplemented by anything higher, more practical or more effective, which has been since offered as the basis of peace, or of other philanthropic propaganda. So far I have described only one of the constituent elements of the great Peace army. I will endeavor to describe the others with equal fidelity but more brevity.

The Peace movement was carried on by these Societies and on these principles only until the year 1867.

In that year there is manifest an extraordinary and most encouraging development of Peace sentiment and a singular increase of activity arising from it, on the continent. It is a year of origins. At least six or eight new Societies sprung into existence in France or were originated by Frenchmen. The two principal ones will sufficiently illustrate my topic. They were typical of the rest.

The *Ligue Internationale de la Paix*, International League of Peace, was founded by M. Passy in Paris. It was the child of the new awakening of Peace sentiment in France which marked that period. Under the name of the French Society of the Friends of Peace (*La Société Française des Amis de la Paix*) it continued to do a very useful work until the year 1889, the year of the last Paris Exhibition, when having become somewhat moribund it amalgamated with another and a later society, and so began a new career of life and usefulness.

From the public declaration issued on the foundation of the new Society we gather the principles and purpose of its formation :

“ The undersigned, united in the same sentiments of prudence, of justice, and of humanity — considering that War and the reciprocal violence which it engenders are in manifest contradiction to all the tendencies of modern civilization, and especially to that irresistible movement which more and more brings men together by means of labor ;

“ Convinced that true patriotism, in proportion as it makes all nations better appreciate their own independence, imposes upon them also more visibly the duty to abstain from all attempt upon, and menace against, the independence of other nations ;

“ Declare that they regard it as a duty to defend and to propagate, to the best of their ability, those great principles of mutual respect which ought to be the common charter of the human race ;

“ And with this view they do hereby constitute themselves a Committee for the organization of an International and Permanent League of Peace.”

This declaration formed a model of some of the later societies. Herr Van Eck, for instance, writing to Mr. H. Richard from the

Hague word of the formation of the Dutch Peace Society, which is still in active operation, says, in October, 1870: "We have adopted a basis similar to that of the first Committee of the Paris League of 1867, and shall include in our ranks persons of each of the political parties and also members of the several religious denominations, whether Protestant, Catholic or Jewish."

Thus the Paris League of 1867 became the type of another section of the Peace army. Its principles differed widely from those of the older Societies, though equally with them its purpose was Peace, and it was always in close alliance with them."

A still wider departure was made in the formation of the International League of Peace and Liberty, at Geneva, in the same year — a departure so great as to create some misgivings on the part of others already associated with the movement. During the twenty-five years of its history this society has done yeoman service in the peace cause, and under its genial and noble-hearted founder and President, Mr. Charles Lemonnier, to the wider cause of human freedom. But the advanced political opinions of the League, its qualified endorsement of war, emphasized by the fact that General Garibaldi presided at the Congress by which it was constituted and that its avowed object was to substitute a national militia for a standing army, were sufficient to awaken some hesitation, especially on the part of those who objected to war itself and not to the mere means or form of organization, by which war was to be waged.

Accordingly, we find M. Passy declaring on behalf of his society: "There has never been between the Peace League, established in Paris by a certain number of individuals whose names have been published and the Congress of Geneva, held later in that city, any sort of solidarity. We frankly confess we do not understand peace as those of Geneva appear to view it, and that we desire it in the means used as well as in the ends."

An official statement made on behalf of the League expresses its principles and purposes thus: "The great object of the League was universal peace; and the only means of acquiring it was to establish an inter-communication of feeling between the different peoples, and afterwards to secure to them the means of averting any wars which would not result in general good. All they desired was to show to the world that there was a way for establishing good governments and universal friendship throughout Europe." In this object of the League all can surely join; and, speaking in one of the great cities of the United States of America I may be pardoned if I express the devout aspiration that some of us may live to see the attainment of its great idea as one of the surest guarantees of peace, in the creation of the "United States of Europe."

The League is both parent and type of another very large part of our peace forces.

A branch of the League of Peace and Liberty was formed in London in December, 1868, by Mr. Cremer and others. This was followed in July, 1870, by the formation, on the same lines, of the Workmen's Peace Association, now designated the International Arbitration League, which is one of the principal British Societies and of which Mr. Cremer is still the able and indefatigable Secretary.

The other of the chief societies is "The International Arbitration and Peace Association," which is the type of the more recent European Societies, and the parent of many of them. The chief purposes of the Association are declared to be :

1. "To create, educate and organize public opinion throughout Europe in favor of the substitution of Arbitration for War.

2. "To promote a better understanding and more friendly feeling between the citizens of different nations.

3. "To correct erroneous statements in the public press or in parliaments on international questions."

Our revered and honored friend, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, whose absence we all deplore to-day, who has been the spokesman and soul and working right hand of the Society, thus expresses the faith that is in him and in it :

"I shall now be asked, what is my conclusion? Where is my hope of peace? I say at once :

"In the growth and development and organization of the Democracy in all countries.

"In organizing close international relations between the Democracies.

"In the frank recognition of all just claims on the part of other nations, and in proposing arbitration if differences arise.

"In having military and naval forces strong enough to hold our own, and compel foreign nations to do us justice, if at any time their governments think they can keep peace and power at home by going to war with us.

"By a more considerate, fair and honorable treatment of foreign nations by our newspapers."

I have now given you as briefly and clearly as I am able, using rather their own words than my own that I may not misrepresent them, some account of the origin, principles and purposes of the Peace Societies which are represented in this Congress.

They all work together, each in its own order, banded in a real brotherhood and moved by a common spirit, each doing the task for which it is specially adapted, each witnessing for the truth it specially embodies. Union of this kind is not only practicable, but as you see in this Congress, actual. Organic federation between elements so diverse in their fundamental principles appears to me in the nature of things impossible.

Naturally I incline to the oldest type. Convinced as I am to the inmost core of my nature that the one hope of the world is Jesus Christ, and that only in His laws and precepts and spirit are to be found the most practicable policy and the truest expedience and, behind both policy and theory, the great force by which the reform and regeneration of society are to be accomplished; convinced as I am that all progress is illusion—a mirage, a shimmer of glittering sand, which does not enshrine the mind of Christ, righteousness, brotherhood, union, and divine self-sacrifice in the heart of the world, and that His spirit and laws are sufficient for all purposes; convinced as I am of these, I am bound in sober earnest to look upon any attempt to accomplish great reforms without Him, as the adoption of means which have the necessary and effective force left out. Still that does not prevent my giving both heart and hand to any one who will accept them in the world's work, and, particularly, in this work for Peace.

I will not offend his prejudices, if I can possibly avoid it. I will not intrude my religious faith and my loyalty to Jesus Christ upon him. I will keep these among the hidden sanctities and springs of life and action in me. But in return I will expect from him, as the first principle of free and equal co-operation, that he will not ask me to surrender them or even hint my disloyalty to my Divine Master and to my honest convictions, as the condition of our working together.

Then, as to the methods of our propaganda, I will remind you that Arbitration is not some self-acting system of political mechanics, needing only suitable and perfected and permanent machinery. It has to be adopted, it has to be applied, and for this is necessary a favorable disposition. Arbitration is, after all, a mere method, a mere instrument, a mere means to an end; that end being such an adjustment of international differences as will secure international peace. It is a mere instrument, I say, and behind the instrument there must be the hand to use it, and behind the hand the intelligent will, and for moral purposes, behind the will, the favoring disposition.

Our work, therefore, is to provide principles not policies for governments, taking care of course to show the bearing of principles upon policies. The presentation of right principles will, if it be judicious, appeal to the reason and conscience of rulers, and will be really effective even where it may seem to be unheeded. The attempt to furnish policies will surely be resented as an interference with the prerogative of government and expose us to the charge of arrogant meddlesomeness.

Kings must be taught as though you taught them not; and ministers and people too.

Moreover, to be statesmanlike we must be both logical and thorough. All statecraft is defective which leaves out of account

the spiritual forces, which are active in the community and the deepest instincts and sentiments of the people.

I hold with Whittier that the main thing, aye, the necessary thing, is to give truth a voice. We may trust her to do the rest when she has gained a hearing. *Magna est veritas et praevalebit*; and if truth cannot accomplish what is necessary, there is no other effective way. If the judgment be not satisfied, any attempt to carry our point, and to compel obedience to our personal will, is a return to the old regime of coercion and tyranny, and is likely to lead to the old brute methods of war.

Government is power, we were reminded by Judge Bonney last evening in introducing the President of the Congress, but he added, the power of government is moral force. The law of executive government is just and right and impartial administration. The power of government is moral. It is righteousness which exalteth a nation. It is righteousness which establishes the throne; the work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance, i. e., mutual confidence forever. "The Kingdom of God," the typical kingdom, the ideal government, "is righteousness and peace," and their result "joy—joy in the Holy Ghost," that is, in the highest faculties of the people; and joy, that is, prosperity, in the material circumstances of the nation—imperfectly, very imperfectly expressed in the old political maxim, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." So that, in a deeper sense than was ever intended by the memorable utterance—a sense which makes it applicable to all times and lands, *L'empire c'est la paix*.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next paper is on the "History and Work of Peace Societies in Europe," by William C. Braithwaite, Counsellor at Law, London, which will be read by Mr. Alfred F. Morgan of London.

MR. MORGAN then read the following paper:

HISTORY AND WORK OF PEACE SOCIETIES IN EUROPE.

No one who patiently looks into the question can doubt the reality of the advance which the cause of International Peace has made during the present century. It is not pretended that this advance is due solely or even mainly to the work of Peace Societies. They are the growth of the last eighty years, while the gradual triumph of law over brute force among civilized men has been going forward throughout history. It remains true, however, that the formation of Peace Societies was itself a significant event, and that their work has been a powerful aid to the cause.

The first of these propositions is well brought out by Emerson, who insists on the advance which was made as soon as the thought

of love supplanting hate as the basis of international life had crystallized into a definite idea in the minds of a few men. "The idea itself," he said, "is the epoch; the fact that it has become so distinct to any small number of persons as to become a subject of prayer and hope, of concert and discussion — that is the commanding fact. This having come, much more will follow. Revolutions go not backward. The star, once risen, though only one man in the hemisphere has yet seen its upper limb in the horizon, will mount and mount, until it becomes visible to other men, to multitudes, and climbs the zenith of all eyes."

FUNCTIONS OF PEACE SOCIETIES.

The aid rendered to the cause by Peace Societies is equally unquestionable. Certain work seems peculiarly their province — work which they must do if it is to be done at all.

First, then, it falls to them to *organize* the army of Peace; to roll into one overwhelming body of influence the myriad dissevered individual influences which, for want of union, fail to form a barrier against war.

In the second place they are charged with the maintenance of an *educational propaganda* for Peace, which shall instil its principles into the young, and win over neutral or hostile minds.

Thirdly, they should act as *Vigilance Committees* scrutinizing the foreign and military policy of governments, watching the tone of the press and of public opinion, and showing themselves alert to protest against every deviation from national justice.

Fourthly, they should press forward *practical measures* in the direction of Arbitration and Peace.

Lastly, they should investigate the fundamental principles of Peace, and work out solutions of the international problems which confront the world, so as to be ready with a wise and practical scheme of pacific policy.

It is tempting to enlarge on these five points. The bare statement of them shows the value of Peace societies, and the need for supporting them at the highest point of efficiency.

With so extended a program of work, it is not surprising that a number of societies should have grown up with somewhat differing objects, and overlapping to some extent in their work. While this illustrates the extraordinary vitality of the Peace movement, it is attended by some disadvantage in financial weakness and waste of strength. In recent years, however, the Universal Peace Congresses and the establishment of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, have done much to bring about federation, not in name, but in action between the Peace societies of the world, and this union of effort has materially increased their influence.

ENGLISH SOCIETIES.

My historical notes must, from the nature of the case, be brief and imperfect. The important Peace societies of America are to be dealt with in another paper, but the bare enumeration of the European societies would exhaust the time allowed me.

England may come first, being the natural link between America and the old world, and standing aloof to a large extent both from the politics and the militarism of Europe.

The three leading British Societies are the Peace Society of London, the International Arbitration League and the International Arbitration and Peace Association, and to these I shall confine myself.

THE PEACE SOCIETY.

The Peace Society was established under the name of the "*Society for the promotion of permanent and universal Peace*," on June 14, 1816, four days before the first anniversary of Waterloo. Peace had at length dawned on Europe. The revival of a religious spirit in England was asserting itself in Anti-slavery, Missionary and Bible Societies. The Holy Alliance by which the emperors of Austria, Prussia and Russia declared their determination to rule according to the precepts of the Christian religion had not yet been shown to be false in the hopes which it inspired, and terribly real in the domination which it established. To the Friends and others who founded the Peace Society the time seemed to have come for bringing into the light of day the principles of Peace which had been hitherto suffered by Christians to be upheld, almost alone among the churches, by the Society of Friends.

The Society was based on the principle "that War is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and the true interest of mankind." Its twofold object was an educational propaganda and the upholding of a Christian policy of peace. It has always been unsectarian and international in its membership.

The first work of the Society lay in the formation of a Peace literature, and to this the ready pens of Thomas Clarkson, the great abolitionist; Jonathan Dymond, the author of the famous "*Essays on Morality*;" Joseph John Gurney, and others contributed. The *Herald of Peace*, the organ of the Society, was I believe, begun in 1822. Larger work was undertaken with the appointment of the late Mr. Henry Richard, as secretary, in 1848, the year of revolutions, and of the downfall of absolutism in Europe. It became possible to carry the Peace movement into France and Germany. A series of International Peace Congresses was organized, which were held from 1848 to 1853, at Brussels, Paris, Frankfort, London, Manchester and Edinburgh successively. It is difficult for us to realize how bright were the hopes of these years. The historian of modern Europe tells us:—

“never had the ideal of industrial Peace been more impressively set before mankind than in the years which succeeded the convulsion of 1848.”* The great Exhibition at London, in 1851, seemed the emblem and harbinger of a new epoch in which the only rivalry would be in the arts of Peace. The ideal was shattered by the outbreak of the Crimean War. The war-fever overwhelmed the protest made by the Friends of Peace. In 1856, however, Mr. Richard achieved a signal triumph by inducing Lord Clarendon to propose the resolution which became one of the protocols of the treaty of Paris, and declared it to be the wish of the leading European powers “that States between which any serious misunderstandings may arise, should, before appealing to arms, have recourse, so far as circumstances might allow, to the good offices of a friendly power.” From the outbreak of the Crimean War to the death of Lord Palmerston in 1865, the Peace society saw little fruit for its patient efforts. Soon afterwards, however, fresh work on the continent of Europe opened before it. An armed Peace was already stifling progress and prosperity. Peace societies were being formed; there was, indeed, something like a popular revolt against the burdens of militarism. Accordingly in 1869, Mr. Richard visited the continent with the object of initiating resolutions in the different legislatures in favor of mutual and simultaneous disarmament. The visit gave much promise of success, but the Franco-German War broke out, and the war system riveted its chains more tightly on Europe. Meanwhile the Peace Society rendered good service in England in supporting the Government in its position of neutrality, and in resisting the agitation set on foot in favor of conscription. In 1873, Mr. Richard crowned his career by carrying in the House of Commons a resolution in favor of a general and permanent system of Arbitration, and he followed up this success by a visit — which was almost a triumphal progress of peace — to the capitals of Europe. The movement which had been so ably pioneered by the Peace Society was now spreading.

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION LEAGUE.

The *Workmen's Peace Association*, now called the *International Arbitration League*, was founded in 1870, and has rendered good service by expressing the voice of industrial England on behalf of Peace. This Society organized the Paris Peace Congress of 1873, and has been foremost in promoting the Interparliamentary Peace Conferences, by which members of European Parliaments have united in the cause. Its secretary, Mr. Cremer, has given much of his attention to the establishment of permanent arbitral relations between the sister-nations of England and America. At his instance a resolution in favor of such a permanent Arbitral Treaty was passed by the House of Commons on the 16th of last

* *History of Modern Europe*, by C. A. Fyffe, ed. 1892. Vol. iii, p. 180.

June, in the form in which it was moved by Mr. Gladstone. England will not recede from this resolution, passed after deliberate debate, unanimously, and with the expressed approval of both political parties. Mr. Cremer mentioned in the course of his speech that upwards of two millions of people had by petition or resolution endorsed the motion.

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE ASSOCIATION.

In 1880, the *International Arbitration and Peace Association* was formed with the advocacy of Arbitration, and the promotion of a better understanding between citizens of different nations as the main planks in its platform. This Society has been vigilant in watching foreign policy, and the tone of the press, and has steadily promoted the federation of Peace Societies throughout the world. It has done much to keep in close touch with the ramifications of the Peace movement throughout Europe, and has also made valuable contributions to the thorough and wise investigation of the international problems which have to be faced by the Friends of Peace. Its work has been much aided by the talented writers whose articles appear in its monthly organ, *Concord*, and by the wide experience and European influence of its veteran Chairman, Mr. Hodgson Pratt.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Meanwhile the parent Peace Society has not rested on its oars. Since Mr. Richard's retirement in 1885, the post of secretary has been ably filled by Mr. William Jones, and of late years by the present secretary, Dr. Darby. With the help of some twenty auxiliary societies, it has steadily maintained its propaganda of Peace by means of literature and lectures, and has worked shoulder to shoulder with other societies in opposition to jingoism, and in support of practical measures of Peace Reform. Of recent years it has been signally successful in popularizing the Sunday before Christmas as a Peace Sunday. From thousands of pulpits the cause of Peace is now proclaimed on that day, in the name of Christ, and the hope expressed by John Bright forty years ago seems nearing its fulfilment:—the hope that the churches of England, awaking from their slumbers, would gird up their loins to the work of Peace.*

In organic connection with the chief English Peace Societies, large women's auxiliaries are in active work. Those who are the most fully acquainted with the inner wheels of the movement, will be the first to recognize how much of its energy and enthusiasm depends upon the many earnest women who have shown themselves foremost in this as in other great moral reforms.

Before passing to the Peace movement on the continent, a short reference must be made to the Society of Friends. This religious

* Speech at Edinburgh, October 13, 1853.

body does not content itself with passively holding the doctrine of the unlawfulness of War to the Christian. Besides the important support which its members have always given to the general Peace movement, it maintains a direct Peace work of its own, and has again and again championed the cause in times of crisis. The deputation to St. Petersburg on the eve of the Crimean War, and the various funds raised at its instance for the relief of the victims of war or famine have done much to refute the idea that the advocacy of Peace is a mere selfish cloak for inertness or want of patriotism.

PEACE WORK AMONG THE LATIN RACES.

In turning to the Peace work on the continent, we will speak first of the movement among the Latin races. Here the Roman Catholic Church has dwarfed other forms of Christian faith, but its claims to temporal power and its repression of liberty of thought have raised in revolt against it a great body of educated and enlightened opinion.

The result is that the Roman Catholics are left to support Peace and Arbitration independently, and in their own way, while the main stream of Peace advocacy flows from men who are inspired by humanitarian motives. The religion of humanity by which the fetters of many a superstition and many a tyranny have been broken, gives a high place among the articles of its faith to the great ideas of the brotherhood of nations, and the solidarity of their interests. We heartily welcome to our ranks men who are inspired by these lofty ideals — which are indeed the ideals of Christ's kingdom on earth — and who have borne witness to their faith by lives of whole-hearted devotion to the sacred cause of Peace.

The Peace movement on the Continent is for the most part the growth of the last thirty years, although we would not forget the services rendered by the Society of Christian Morality (*La Société de morale Chrétienne*) during the second quarter of the century, nor the interest aroused by the Paris and Frankfort Congresses at the end of that period. It was, however, in 1867 that the more modern movement began. In that year M. Frederic Passy and other eminent Frenchmen called forth a successful protest against the then impending war between France and Germany on account of Luxembourg. The French Arbitration Society (*La Société Française de l'Arbitrage entre les nations*) grew out of this action and we hope will long enjoy the services of its distinguished President, M. Passy. The same year saw the foundation at Geneva, by the late M. Lemonnier, of the International League of Peace and Liberty. The ultimate aim of the League is shown by the title of its Journal "The United States of Europe" (*Les Etats-Unis de l'Europe*) — an aim which seems utopian to us in England until we remember that it has been achieved in the New World. The annual congresses of the

League have been of almost European importance: — the stormy congress at which Garibaldi made his appeal in favor of Italian unity will long be remembered; here the eloquent voice of Victor Hugo has been raised on behalf of the new social régime of international justice, while the devotion and ability of M. Lemonnier have always invested these annual meetings with a well-merited influence.

The Peace Societies of France include one or two others of special interest. The Familistère of Guise, founded by the late André Godin, is a most noteworthy example of the harmonious co-operation of labor and capital. An association which has eliminated industrial war is a fit champion of International Peace. Delegates from its Peace Society have been present at all the recent Congresses. Another interesting society is that of the Young Friends of Peace (*Association des jeunes amis de la paix*). Its Peace Almanacs have been received with great favor, and its members have done excellent service in seeking to band together university students in the cause of Peace.

An enumeration of the other French Peace Societies would be tedious, but when we come to Italy the task would be still more difficult. Italy has elected to take her place among the armed powers of Europe, but the crushing weight of her coat of mail calls forth loud and increasing protest from her most far-seeing citizens. The report of the Peace Congress at Rome, in 1891, shows that there were then seventy-five Italian Peace Societies. The Lombard Union (*Società internazionale per la Pace*, "*Unione Lombarda*") and the Societies at Rome, Venice and Palermo, rank foremost among these. The Congresses of Italian Societies have done much to spread the movement. In 1890 the electors were appealed to with a definite Peace program. This was repeated in 1892, and it is evident that the cause is in the hands of men who will not allow it to sleep. The Italian Societies owe much to Mr. Hodgson Pratt's efforts, and are led by some of the most distinguished men in Italy, besides having the invaluable support of Signor Moneta's paper, *Il Secolo*. Their energy should be an inspiration to us.

In the other Latin countries of Europe there is less activity. In Spain the cause has the support of a number of influential deputies and senators, and there are societies at Madrid and Barcelona. In Belgium, the Belgium section of the International Arbitration and Peace Federation is doing good work. The isolated Latin country of Roumania was represented at the Berne Peace Congress by no less than sixteen delegates from the University society of Bucharest and the Roumanian co-operative society.

The Protestant churches in Italy have shown themselves alive to the value of the movement, and the London Peace Society has done active work amongst Protestants in France.

PEACE WORK AMONG THE SLAVONIC RACES.

The Slavonic peoples of Europe have, I believe, a rooted dislike to aggressive war, but under present conditions this dislike cannot find adequate expression. Count Tolstoi correctly interprets the heart of the Russian peasant. In Servia we find Nazarenes willing to go to prison rather than engage in military service. In Bulgaria, Quaker views on war find ready acceptance. The Slav character is solidly grounded in patience and endurance, and if Russia seems to menace European Peace it arises from her political exigencies and not from the disposition of her peoples.

SCANDINAVIA.

The Peace Movement takes a very different complexion in the Scandinavian kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden and Norway. So far from being latent, it is here triumphant, national almost in its character. These countries are committed to a neutral policy, and desire the reign of international law in order that their neutral positions may be secured. Hence we find that the "Society for the Neutralization of Denmark" (*Foreningen til Danmarks neutralisering*), founded in 1882, and led by M. Fredrik Bajer, has been able to present to the King a petition in favor of Arbitration signed by a tenth of the whole population, and to secure the adoption by the Folketing or Lower House of Parliament of a resolution in favor of permanent Arbitration Treaties with other States. The Danish Society has seventy Local Committees and about 3000 members. In Norway, the parliament has given official acknowledgment to the movement by paying the expenses of its delegates to the Interparliamentary Peace Conferences. And throughout Scandinavia the influence of the poet Björnson and the talents of Swedish writers, such as Arnoldson and Björklund, have done much to educate the population. The Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society of Stockholm has recently proved the earnestness of its efforts by offering a prize of \$200, for the practical plan best calculated to develop an international opinion, able to withstand the tide of militarism.

GERMANY.

One of the most encouraging features of recent years is the growth of Peace opinion in the German countries of Europe. Metternich and Bismarck have associated Austria and Germany with the policy of militarism, a policy which has seemed to be imposed on them by their geographical position. But there are welcome signs of reaction.

The "Frankfort Association for promoting International Arbitration" has for many years stood almost alone. Its example has now led to the foundation of another society at Wiesbaden. Better still, a society for the whole of Germany has been founded at Berlin, and promises to yield large results. Both at Berlin and

at Vienna, the famous novel, "*Die Waffen Nieder*," of the Baroness Von Suttner has created great interest in Peace, and the Baroness has formed an influential Austrian society (*Oesterreichische Gesellschaft der Friedensfreunde*), with an associated society among the students of the university. A Peace Journal with the same title as the novel has also been started.

In Holland, the Dutch Peace Society and the *Pax Humanitate* are both active in the cause which inspired their great countryman, Grotius.

SWITZERLAND.

We have left Switzerland till last:—the cradle of Arbitration, the home of international law, the country in which the races of France and Germany and Italy blend into one. A former President of the Swiss Confederation, M. Louis Ruchonnet, presided over last year's Congress at Berne, the city which will one day be the capital of the United States of Europe. Meanwhile it is the headquarters of the admirable work of the Peace Bureau, and in their hands the cause of Peace will remain scarcely less dear to the Swiss heart than Swiss freedom or the Swiss mountains.

CONCLUSION.

Last year, M. Louis Ruchonnet enforced, in eloquent language, the duty of organizing Peace. He said the task of enrolling mankind under our colors was a primary duty. Peace societies should be founded everywhere, adhesions should be gathered in, a bond of common action among the masses should be created, thus producing a true public opinion which would compel governments to obey its voice. Much has been done towards the accomplishment of this hope; much has still to be done. Our position cannot be one of mere negation. The activities of Peace must drive out and replace the activities of War. We must change the outworn motto, *si vis pacem para bellum*, which fourteen centuries have refuted into the truer watchword "if you wish peace, prepare peace;" and when the way of Peace has been prepared, we know that its advent will not long be delayed. Progress may seem slow, but the fruit will be brought forth through patience. We dare not speak of failure, for the cause and the battle are the Lord's and with Him is assured victory.

Failure? While tide-floods rise and boil
Round cape and isle, in port and cove,
Resistless, star-led from above;
What though our tiny wave recoil? *

THE CHAIRMAN: The next paper is on the "History and Work of Peace Societies in America," by Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood of Boston.

* Kingsley, "On the death of a certain Journal," 1852.

DR. MUELLER from Sweden: I merely want to make one correction in the paper that has just been read. We intended to make the prize for the essay five thousand francs, but we are not all millionaires in Sweden; it is a poor country, and we decided at last, as we would have to pay the bill ourselves, to put it at one thousand francs.

DR. TRUEBLOOD then read his paper as follows:

HISTORY AND WORK OF PEACE SOCIETIES IN AMERICA.

So far as is known, the first publication in America, professedly and exclusively for the cause of peace, was a tract written in 1809 by a Presbyterian merchant of New York City. Three literary men, one of whom was a clergyman, replied to this in a pamphlet entitled "The Duty of a Christian in a Trying Situation." This was answered by the New York merchant, who finally won a few of his friends to the cause of peace. In 1810 a few friends of peace discussed the expediency of forming a peace society, but the prospect of war with Great Britain stood in the way at that time. The awakening of sentiment in this country, as in England, on the subject of peace had as its immediate cause the disastrous and cruel wars which devastated all Europe in the early part of this century. Its deeper and more fundamental cause was the increased appreciation of the spirit and principles of Christianity with which this wonderful century opened. The peace movement is one of the great group of moral causes which, beginning in its first quarter, have already filled this century with their life and triumphs.

The New York merchant, alluded to above, published early in 1815 another pamphlet entitled "War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ," and in August of the same year the New York Peace Society was formed with more than twenty members, "embracing men of all sects and parties." This was the first peace society that ever existed.

On Christmas day, 1814, the venerable Dr. Noah Worcester, a Congregational minister, published in Boston an ably written brochure, entitled "A Solemn Review of the Custom of War," which came like an awakening trumpet blast, and which for years was the chief document of the peace propaganda, and one of the leading influences which brought about the organization of many peace societies in this country and in Great Britain. Some gentlemen who had read this "Solemn Review" formed the Ohio Peace Society, Warren Co., Ohio, the second of December, 1815. The day after Christmas of the same year twenty-two persons signed the Constitution of the Massachusetts Peace Society.

Among these three societies, formed within a few months of and without any knowledge of one another, the Massachusetts society

took the lead. Among its first signers were the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the State, two judges, Rev. William E. Channing, several Professors of Harvard and the President, Dr. Kirkland, under whose administration Charles Sumner entered that institution. By 1819, this society had one thousand members who, the report says, were "respectable" persons, a statement not difficult for this audience to believe. By 1821 the Massachusetts Society had nineteen auxiliaries, the establishment of which it had early commenced. By this time, also, there were eight societies in Ohio. Societies were formed in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Georgia, and in 1828 there were no less than fifty of these organizations in the United States.

One of the chief reasons why the Massachusetts society was the acknowledged leader among these early associations was the publication of *The Friend of Peace* by its Secretary, Dr. Worcester. This was continued for twelve years, from 1815 to 1827, entirely on his personal responsibility. It was a very able publication, as any one will see by turning over its pages, treating the subject for whose promotion it was established from nearly every standpoint. It had a wide circulation for the time, and did much to transform and mould public sentiment in favor of peace. Its editor, like Dr. Henry Holcome, who founded the Pennsylvania Peace society, had fought in the Revolution and hence spoke from actual knowledge of the horrors of war.

These fifty scattered societies, many of them small and feeble, early began to feel the need of more perfect union in their work. In 1826 the Maine society influenced by William Ladd, the second Apostle of Peace, led in a movement for a national society. The Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania societies followed. A provisional constitution was drawn up and submitted to all the societies in the country and by them approved, under which the American Peace Society met for the first time on the eighth day of May, 1828, in the city of New York. William Ladd, a graduate of Harvard, at the time a retired sea-captain and one of the wealthiest men and largest farmers in Maine, was chosen leader of the new society. From this time till his death in 1841 he consecrated his time and his fortune to the cause of peace, to whose advocacy he felt that he had a direct divine call. He commenced at once, at his own charges, the publication of the *Harbinger of Peace*, which ran through three volumes till April, 1831. Most of the societies then existing, more than fifty in number, became auxiliary to the new society, and a number of new ones were soon organized. The Connecticut society remained independent, and by 1835, every county in that State had a peace society.

The American Peace Society had its headquarters in New York till 1835, when it removed to Hartford. At that time the *Calumet*, which had succeeded the *Harbinger of Peace* in 1831, was

dropped and the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, whose publication had been begun at Hartford the previous year by the Connecticut society, was adopted in its stead and afterwards published under the auspices of the American Peace Society. In 1837 the American Peace Society removed with its journal to Boston, from which its work has been carried on ever since, a period of fifty-six years. Many of the societies which in the beginning were its auxiliaries gradually disappeared. Some of the stronger ones continued for many years and did excellent work in their several localities. The society finally, finding it difficult to keep up these local auxiliaries, many of them having only a nominal existence, ceased its effort to maintain them and turned its attention to consolidating and strengthening its own work in various ways. It now has life members in twenty of the States. It has issued its journal, the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, continuously since 1828, and has also published for many years the *Angel of Peace* for children.

Into the details of the work of any one of the societies in this country, time will not permit me to go, but further on a condensed statement of their general lines of work will be given.

The Universal Peace Union, of which our honored co-worker, Alfred H. Love, has been president since its foundation, was organized in 1866. Some of its first members had belonged to the New England Non-resistance Society, a useful but not long-lived organization founded in 1838. The Universal Peace Union was founded and has always tried to proceed upon the principle that all war, even defensive, is wrong. It has over thirty auxiliary or branch societies in different parts of the country, eight or nine of which are active and doing excellent work in connection with the Union. These are the Washington Society, the New York Society, the Rhode Island, the Pennsylvania, the Massachusetts, the Connecticut, the South Carolina and the Chicago branches. Of the rest I have no definite information. The Universal Peace Union has published, since its organization, *The Peacemaker*, with which many of you are acquainted.

"The Peace Association of Friends in America" was organized in 1869. No history of peace work would be at all complete without a special allusion to this body of Christians. Dr. Worcester, in one of the early numbers of the *Friend of Peace*, mentions that in 1815 there were one thousand congregations of Friends in this country, each of which was a genuine peace society. The number of Friends' churches has of late years considerably increased, and what Dr. Worcester said of them in 1815 is still essentially true. Ever since the days of William Penn, in time of war as in time of peace, they have both maintained that all war is contrary to the spirit and teachings of Christ and that it is unreasonable and unnecessary. It was through their influence chiefly that the Indian Peace Policy was adopted by President Grant, a policy which has since greatly

reduced the number of Indian wars. "The Peace Association of the Friends," as a peace society, was organized in order, if possible, more fully to confirm the members of the Church in peace principles and more especially to spread these abroad in the world. Located at first at New Vienna, Ohio, and since at Richmond, Ind., this organization began in 1870 the publication of the *Messenger of Peace*, which has the largest circulation of any peace paper in this country and is still edited by the venerable Daniel Hill, secretary of the Association since its organization.

Of Christian bodies, furthermore, the Mennonites and Moravians deserve honorable mention, for their consistent devotion to peace doctrines, but I am not aware that they have any regularly organized peace societies, outside of their usual channels of church work.

The "Christian Arbitration and Peace Society" of Philadelphia was organized in 1886, as a branch of the American Peace Society, but limiting its membership entirely to Christian believers, the American Peace Society having always welcomed into its membership any who, whatever their belief as to purely defensive war, were willing and desirous to labor to remove the causes of war and to diminish its frequency. The work of the "Christian Arbitration and Peace Society" has been chiefly directed to stirring up the Christian Churches in this country and in parts of Europe to increased activity in the cause of the Prince of Peace, as the great Peacemaker among men. It published for a few years the *Christian Arbitrator*, which about three years ago was combined with the *Messenger of Peace*, already alluded to above.

The Peace Department of the National W. C. T. U., though only one of the phases of the work carried on by this great organization of women, is really one of the strongest and most influential of our peace organizations. It was established in 1887 at the time of the annual meeting of the W. C. T. U. at Nashville, and placed under the direction of Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey of Winthrop Centre, Maine. It now has superintendents in twenty-five States and publishes the *Pacific Banner* and the *Acorn*. Its work is chiefly among women and children, though it has a strong and kindly hand to lend wherever there is work to be done.

Of independent societies there are, further, the "Friends' Peace Association of Philadelphia," the "Rhode Island Peace Society" and the "Pacific Coast Arbitration Society" at Monterey, Cal. The work of these is largely local or in co-operation with the societies of a more or less national character mentioned above.

The work of the peace societies in America has been so many sided, has extended over such a long period and has so mingled with the general life of the country that it is no easy task to give any just estimate of it. Only a general summary of its most salient features can be given here.

1. The first thing to be accomplished was the transformation of public opinion. The peace societies have often been charged with being sentimental and visionary and unpractical. But it is self-evident that in any reform the first appeal must be made to thought and feeling. So long as men thought war glorious and necessary and right and Christian, it was of little use to talk of mediation, arbitration and arbitral tribunals. The history of the peace movement since 1815, in the peace societies, in general society, and in the parliaments of nations, shows most clearly that every practical measure for the real prevention of war has had its tap-root in a transformed thought and sentiment. This first work in which the peace societies have had their full share, though by no means the only agencies, was set about in various ways. They brought together into their union, and moulded into a common influence the men and women who had begun to cherish the better hopes and the new ideals, and the mere association together, in the work, of such persons as Dr. Channing, Dr. Kirkland, Josiah Quincy, William Lloyd Garrison, Elihu Burritt, John G. Whittier, Andrew P. Peabody, Judge Jay, Thomas S. Grimke, Amasa Walker, Charles Sumner, Robert C. Winthrop, Julia Ward Howe, and many others of like spirit and purpose, has had great influence on public opinion, aside from anything they may have written or said.

Ministers of the Gospel were invited to preach special sermons on peace and a large number responded, the American Peace Society in 1835 having five hundred ministers on its list pledged to preach on the subject once a year.

A peace literature, of which there was practically none in 1815, had to be created. Peace papers were published and circulated by thousands. A great variety of tracts and pamphlets on all phases of the subject were sent out in all directions. Annual addresses were delivered for many years before the American Peace Society by eminent men like Quincy, Peabody, Sullivan, Channing, Jay and Sumner, and widely circulated and read. Agents and lecturers were sent out to deliver addresses and to secure the co-operation of the friends of peace in different sections of the country. The other day I came across a curious old document in which it was stated that the people of Vermont generally thought that the peace societies were the cause of the Rebellion in 1861. If they had not so broken down the martial spirit in the North, the Southerners would never have dared to rebel. Of course, the Vermonters much overestimated the accomplishments of the peace workers. But that all this work of education, carried on at times under great difficulties from lack of means and because of the indifference or open opposition met with, has had its full share in laying the foundations of the present improved state of public opinion on this subject, there can be no reasonable doubt.

2. Besides this educational work, attention was given almost from the beginning to practical measures for preventing war and preparing substitutes therefor. In 1816, the Massachusetts Peace Society sent a memorial to Congress pleading for mediation, for peaceful modes of settling international differences, and for the lessening of armaments. From that time to this, memorial after memorial of like import has been sent up to Congress from the different peace societies, often through their efforts signed by many thousands of citizens. Protests against possible wars have likewise often been sent to Washington accompanied by suggestions of peaceful ways of adjusting the difficulty, one of the most notable of these being the magnificent protest of five hundred thousand Christian women sent by the W. C. T. U. Peace Department to Washington when the War Department was rubbing up its guns against Chile. There has been scarcely an occasion calling for such action which has not been quickly improved by the peace associations, and it is not exaggerating to say that the long list of peaceful arbitrations between the United States and other countries, amounting in all to nearly forty important cases, the first one of which took place exactly in 1816, the year in which the Massachusetts Society sent the first petition to Congress, is in no small measure due to these efforts.

The peace societies are rightly entitled to the credit of originating the practice of inserting arbitral clauses in commercial and other treaties, a practice now so frequent with civilized nations. The proposal for such treaties was first made in 1841, by Judge William Jay of New York, long a member and president of the American Peace Society, which took up and strongly recommended the proposition. Joseph Sturge, the distinguished English philanthropist, then on a visit to this country, carried the idea across the water, where it quickly took root in the minds of the English peace-workers and since on the continent.

In this same year, 1841, the proposal to hold a general peace congress or convention was first made at a large meeting of peace-workers in Boston on the 26th of July. The idea was carried out and just fifty years ago last June the first general peace convention was held in London. Three hundred delegates were present, thirteen of whom went from this country. The peace societies of America have been well represented, I believe, in all the peace congresses held in Europe since that time, though the trip across the water has been attended with much sacrifice of money and time.

In 1872, Dr. James B. Miles and Elihu Burritt were sent from this country to Europe to try to get up a convention for the discussion of the reform and codification of International Law. The result of their visit to the peace workers of the old world was the holding of such a convention the next year. Out of this grew the Association for the Reform and Codification of International Law,

which has continued its work in Europe since that time, and with which Mr. David Dudley Field has been so honorably connected.

The subject of a high court of nations, now the chief theme of our Peace Congresses and Conferences and already the subject of resolutions in national parliaments, was early discussed by William Ladd, and his essay on this subject in 1840 left little to be said afterwards. It is not too much to hope, and we certainly have a right to expect, that this great practical idea of an international tribunal, advocated by this apostle of peace more than fifty years ago, will soon be realized in some form by the civilized nations.

The peace societies of America are still busy, never more so than now, along all the lines indicated above. More attention has been given by them of late to propaganda in the general press than formerly, because the press is now much more open than it was to peace sentiments. Editors and correspondents are invited to write up certain phases of the subject, and in important cases have been supplied with the necessary material. It is one of the most encouraging signs of the time that many important papers, both of the secular and religious press, have voluntarily taken up this work.

In the schools and colleges also work is not neglected, at least one of our peace journals being sent to nearly all the college and university reading rooms in the land, and among the students of these institutions the new ideas are with increased frequency taken up and seriously studied.

The peace societies have co-operated in recent years with the effort to secure the adoption of arbitration as the settled method of adjusting conflicts between labor and capital, the U. P. U. having been especially active in this direction.

The work of all the peace societies in America, as in all the world, sums itself up in two great lines of work, first, to educate and to consolidate public opinion into the settled conviction that war is wrong, inhuman and unnecessary, and, secondly, to assist in every legitimate way, in securing the adoption of treaties of arbitration between the nations and ultimately of an international tribunal for the speedy and amicable adjustment of all international differences that cannot be adjusted by diplomacy.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last paper this morning will be on "Peace Congresses, Conferences and the International Peace Bureau," by Elie Ducommun, Secretary of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, which will be read by W. G. Hubbard.

W. G. HUBBARD then read the following paper :

PEACE CONGRESSES, CONFERENCES AND THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE BUREAU.

The subject which I am asked to treat in a paper as concise as possible presents certain difficulties in respect to the co-ordination of the parts of which it is composed. We have had in Europe since 1848 great international peace meetings which have simply sprung up spontaneously, prompted by generous thought; others which have been organized by a society already existing, containing a certain number of branches and scattered adherents in different countries. These meetings have taken indifferently the names of congress or conference, although several of them were simply annual meetings of a general character.

1. EARLY PEACE CONGRESSES.

In 1848, immediately after the proclamation of the French Republic, Henry Richard, Secretary of the London Peace Society, and Elihu Burritt went to Paris to organize there an International Peace Congress under the auspices of the English and American societies. The events which occurred in June that year prevented the execution of this project. The two gentlemen repaired to Brussels, where the first Congress took place.

The following year, 1849, a meeting was held in Paris, in St. Cecile Hall, the twenty-second of August, under the presidency of Victor Hugo. The Vice-President was the illustrious Cobden. This Congress lasted three days. In his opening address, Victor Hugo used these words: "A day will come when weapons will fall from men's hands, when cannon balls will be replaced by ballots, by the universal suffrage of peoples, by the venerable arbitration of a great sovereign assembly, which will be to Europe what the Parliament is to England, what the Legislative Body is to France. A day will come when a cannon will be pointed out in a museum, as an instrument of torture is shown there to-day, with astonishment that such a thing could ever have existed. A day will come when those two great groups of peoples, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will be seen stretching out to each other their hands across the seas." The orator added, that, "in the future, the aim of statesmanship, true and noble, should be to enlarge continually the groups of civilized nations, to set a good example to people still barbarous, to substitute arbitration for battles, and finally (and in this the whole matter is summed up) to have justice pronounce the final decision which formerly was secured by force."

The closing day of the Congress was by chance the day of the anniversary of St. Bartholomew. Victor Hugo took advantage of the coincidence to ask for peace between religions as between nations. He did this in such terms that Abbot Duguerry and Pastor Coquerel threw themselves into each other's arms amid

the repeated acclamations of the Congress and of the people in the galleries.

Victor Hugo closed with these words: "Let this day be a memorable one! let it mark the end of the effusion of human blood! let it mark the end of massacres and of wars! let it inaugurate the commencement of the peace of the world! and let it be said that the twenty-fourth of August, 1572, is blotted out and disappears before the twenty-fourth of August, 1849."

The emotion of the audience was very great; bravos broke out on all sides; the English and the Americans arose waving their handkerchiefs and their hats toward the speaker, and at the suggestion of Cobden they gave seven hurrahs.

In 1850 a new Congress took place at Frankfort-on-the-Main. Among the French delegates were Emile de Girardin, Joseph Garnier, Athanase Coquerel, Jr., Cormenin and other distinguished economists.

A fourth Congress was held at London, in the Crystal Palace, Hyde Park, at the time of the first International Exposition. Then these international meetings ceased, while the Peace Societies on the two continents continued their work each in their own way, thus keeping alive the sacred fire which is one day to enlighten humanity delivered from the burden of military budgets and the nightmare of wars.

Sixteen years later, the 27th of April, 1867, the Permanent International League of Peace was founded. As a result of three letters, of Martin Paschoud, of Gustave d'Eichtal and of Frédéric Passy, these three champions, under the influence of a strong awakening of opinion, immediately developed, with the co-operation of Dufour, Michel Chevalier, Jean Dolfus, and other friends of peace, decided to establish this French International Peace Society.

At about the same time and under another current of influence a new series of Peace Congresses was opened at Geneva. The first had as its honorary president Joseph Garibaldi, and as its acting president Mr. Pierre Jolissaint of the Bernese Jura, then a Member of the Council of State from the Canton of Berne. The Congress sat in the Electoral building, from the ninth to the twelfth of September, 1867, and after earnest discussions voted the following resolutions, which form the basis of the constitution of the International League of Peace and Liberty:

"Whereas the great nations of Europe have shown themselves incapable of preserving the peace and of securing the regular development of all the material and moral interests of modern society;

"Whereas the existence and increase of standing armies, constituting a sort of latent war, are incompatible with the liberty and

well being of all classes of society, and especially of the laboring classes ;

“ The International Congress, desirous of establishing peace upon democracy and liberty, decides :

“ That a League of Peace and Liberty, a real cosmopolitan federation shall be founded ;

“ That it shall be the duty of each member of this league to labor for the enlightenment and moulding of public opinion as to the true nature of government as the executor of the will of the people, and as to the means of doing away with the ignorance and prejudices which are so powerful in bringing on wars ;

“ To bring about by its constant efforts the substitution of a system of national militia for that of standing armies ;

“ To study in all countries the condition of the laboring and dependent classes, in order that individual and general well-being may permanently establish the political liberty of the citizens ;

“ The Congress further decides :

“ That there shall be established a permanent central committee with headquarters at Geneva and commissioned :

“ 1. To secure the adhesion of individuals or of societies, especially to make an appeal to the associations already existing or to be created in different countries, in order that they may unite their efforts in promoting the principles proclaimed by the Peace Congress ;

“ 2. To arrange for future meetings of the congress, either at Geneva or in any other free city of Europe ;

“ 3. To edit and to have published the proceedings of the Congress ;

“ 4. To found at Geneva or at Bâle a Franco-German journal entitled *The United States of Europe*.

“ 5. To collect from the adherents fees, fixed at a minimum of 10 centimes (2 cents) a month or one franc twenty centimes (24 cents) a year, and to make the best possible use of them for the work, and to give an account thereof to each session of the Congress.”

It is seen by this citation that the nascent league did not pretend to absorb the other societies, since it made an appeal for their co-operation in the propagation of the principles of peace and liberty.

Once constituted, it held each year a general meeting of its members scattered in the different States of Europe. It set forth its principles with remarkable consistency, it regulated its action, opened, traced out and cleared its pathway by proclaiming above all the abolition of war in all its forms by federation and arbitration, and by proclaiming that that which is useful should be sought for by that which is just, and that the principles of individual justice and independence should be applied in the conduct of national life, as well as in the relations of men one to another.

These annual meetings, I repeat, for a quarter of a century have borne the character of international congresses, because the International League of Peace and Liberty had members in France, in Switzerland, in Germany, in Italy, in Denmark, in England, and because they discussed the general questions relating to the work of peace rather than the internal affairs of a society.

The same observation may be made in reference to an International Conference held in Brussels, in October, 1882, through the influence of the International Arbitration and Peace Association of London.

This association, having sections and members in different countries of Europe, was able to give to the deliberations of its meetings something of the character of universality. The conference at Brussels, presided over by Mr. Hodgson Pratt, was very successful.

It was followed by a second conference, held in the Federal Palace, Berne, from the 4th to the 9th of August, 1884, likewise under the presidency of Mr. Hodgson Pratt. Several speakers made in this conference important addresses on international arbitration, arbitral clauses in Treaties, the neutralization of ocean channels, the establishment of international tribunals and international disarmament.

In September, 1878, during the Universal Exposition, an International Peace Congress was held at Paris, under the presidency of Mr. A. Franck.

The initiative of this Congress had been taken by the London Peace Society, the French Society of the Friends of Peace, the International League of Peace and Liberty, the Universal Peace Union of Philadelphia and the Peace League of the Netherlands, with which had been joined the Humanitarian League of Order of Rome and the Italian League of Liberty, Brotherhood and Peace of Milan.

The dominant idea of this Congress was the formation of a federation of peace societies; but although taken into consideration this idea was not realized. It is nevertheless true that a feeling was already entertained of the necessity of being practical in the pursuit of the work, since in this Congress the creation of an official international parliament and of a permanent bureau or committee of peace was spoken of.

The following declaration of principles was adopted at the Congress: — “In the present condition of Europe the negotiation and conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration between two or more peoples appears to be one of the most effective means of introducing the practice of international arbitration.”

It was in this Congress that the idea of universal Peace Congresses was first mentioned, by Mr. Edmond Thiaudière.

We mention here, also, a Congress rather Italian than International, held at Rome from the 12th to the 16th of May, 1889, under the presidency of Mr. Ruggero Bonghi, for the purpose of creating a more intimate union between the Italian peace societies.

Very complete and interesting papers were presented on this occasion: — 1, by Mr. Moneta, on Disarmament; 2, by Mr. Pareto, on Customs Union; 3, by Mr. Mazzoleni, on International Arbitration; 4, by Mr. Bonghi, on The Italian Peace Movement.

The proceedings of this Congress were edited, in Italian, with great care, by Professor C. Facelli and L. Morandi. They form a volume of one hundred and eighty-six pages. We give the resolutions passed, which are of the following import:

1. The Congress, convinced that the excess of armaments which are incessantly increasing, is dangerous to the future of civilized Europe, expresses the wish that the governments may, with common accord, find means of resolving economic, sanitary and scientific questions.

2. It expresses, likewise, the wish that the military *régime* of the country may be reorganized so as to serve for defence rather than attack, and that all the citizens may be rendered capable of taking part in the defence of the country if menaced by foreign aggression.

3. It invites, also, the adhering societies to exert their influence with the press and with the political representatives of all countries in favor of the propagation of the ideas which have just been expressed.

2. REGULAR ANNUAL CONGRESSES.

(a) First Congress, at Paris, in 1889.

The 11th of November, 1888, the representatives of eight peace societies, of which five were French and three from other countries, met at Paris at the house of Mr. Charles Lemonnier (rue de Chaillot 1 bis), formed themselves into a committee of organization and drew up a letter to the Minister of Commerce and Industry, to express to him the wish to see opened at Paris, during the Exposition of 1889, a Universal Peace Congress, whose labors should form a sequel to those of the International Congress which had been held at Paris during the Exposition of 1878.

Mr. Charles Lemonnier was elected president of this Congress and Mr. Gaston Morin, secretary.

The 15th of January, 1889, the committee addressed to all the peace societies a circular letter accompanied by the following program for the Congress.

1. A study of international arbitration in all the forms and in all the cases to which its principles can be applied; permanent treaties of arbitration between two or more nations.

2. Application of the principle of neutralization to rivers, to navigable maritime or river canals, to straits, to territories, to nations, etc.

3. An international application of the principle of federation.

4. Creation of arbitral colleges on the initiative of the peace societies; introduction into universities, gymnasia, lyceums, colleges and schools, of courts of arbitration, theoretical and practical.

5. Reforms which ought to be made in international law; fundamental principles of an international code.

6. Study, examination and classification of the means and measures which may progressively substitute between nations the juridic state in place of that of war, and finally render disarmament possible.

This program was afterwards worked out in detail and communicated to the societies in this new form by a circular, on the 10th of May.

In the meantime the President of the Council, who was Minis-

ter of Commerce and Industry, and General Commissioner of the Universal Exposition, had appointed the permanent committee of the International Congress, composed of twenty-five members, and the latter had made the following nominations :

Honorary Presidents, Messrs. A. Franck and Charles Lemonnier.

Acting President, Mr. Frederic Passy.

Vice-Presidents, Messrs. Barrodet, Deputy, and Couturier, Senator.

Secretary, Gaston Morin.

Sunday, the 23d of June, 1889, the Congress opened in the Congress Hall of the Trocadero. Delegates were present from a *hundred societies*. In this great meeting an address was made by Frederic Passy, by each one of the Honorary Presidents, and some excellent remarks were made by Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood of Washington. The subsequent sessions were held Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, in the great hall of the Mayoralty of the 6th Ward, St. Sulpice. The forenoons were given up to the sectional meetings and the afternoons to general meetings.

This Congress has been called, not without reason, a line of demarcation between the past and the future,—the past so full of encouragements, the future so full of promise and of difficulties. Among the incidents which were the most noteworthy we may mention the sending of an address by the workingmen of England to the workingmen of France, closing with these words :

“The power of the people is increasing from day to day ; the people are to become all-powerful. This increase of power adds to our responsibility ; it imposes upon us the duty of serving the cause of peace by the practical application of justice.”

The number of resolutions passed on the different questions placed on the program was thirty-five, which referred chiefly to the arbitral clause to be inserted in treaties, with the arbitrators named in advance ; to the adoption of the principle of international arbitration as the basis of the Constitution of each nation ; to respect for neutrality and the extension of neutralization ; to the successive adoption of a common legislation for all economic interests ; to the international application of the principle of federation ; to the creation of an international council whose business it should be to find a pacific solution of conflicts between nations ; to the introduction of instruction in arbitration into the schools and universities ; to the study of a complete system of international legislation rendering wars less frequent ; to justice toward uncivilized races ; to the establishment of international colleges ; finally, to a general peace propaganda.

(b) Second Congress, at London, in 1890.

It was agreed at the first Congress that the second should take place in 1890, in one of the large cities of Europe.

The English Peace Societies, invited from several quarters to undertake the organization of this great universal meeting, yielded to this wish and appointed a provisional committee which performed its task with all the zeal and intelligence that could be desired.

The second Congress opened, therefore, at London, on Monday, the 14th of July, 1890, and continued until Saturday, the 19th. The president of the Committee on Organization, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, yielded with much courtesy and modesty the presidency of the Congress to Mr. David Dudley Field, of the United States of America. Dr. W. Evans Darby and Mr. J. Frederick Green acted as secretaries.

The resolutions passed at this Congress may be considered as explaining and completing in certain respects those of the first Congress, especially in the following particulars :

1. Fraternity between individuals implies fraternity between nations.

The aim of Peace Societies is the establishment of juridical order between nations, and neutralization constitutes a step toward this juridic state.

2. Indigenous and weak races ought to be protected against all abuse by force and guaranteed against the vices of so-called civilized nations.

3. Equitable commercial relations ought to be established between nations as a first step towards freedom of exchange.

4. Uniformity of weights and measures, of money, of postal and telegraphic rates, of methods of transportation, etc., would be desirable,

5. The duty of peace Congresses is to search for means of creating juridical tribunals independent of the executive power whose duty it should be to adjust all disputes which might otherwise result in war.

6. The civilized world is waiting impatiently for the cessation of armaments which are dangerous and cause a general economic uneasiness.

7. No treaty should receive the support of the national representatives in any parliament unless it contain an arbitral clause.

8. A Congress of all the representatives of the European States ought to be called together to devise means for bringing about gradually a general disarmament.

9. The Peace Societies ought to make an active propaganda to induce electors in parliamentary elections to give their vote to the friends of peace, disarmament and arbitration.

10. It is desirable that the societies of Europe and America adopt practical means of common action.

11. Efforts ought to be made in the press to counteract the military prejudices and the errors which, disseminated among the people, are frequently the indirect cause of wars.

12. The Congress invites women to join the societies for the propagation of international peace; it would impress also upon persons engaged in religious instruction the necessity of inculcating the principles of peace and of good will among men.

13. Professors of History ought to call the attention of the young to the terrible evils inflicted upon humanity at all epochs by wars, and teachers ought to instruct their pupils to honor deeds of peace.

14. Military exercises ought to be replaced in the schools by useful physical exercises.

I sum up thus very briefly the general resolutions of the second

Congress; the others had a character more special and having reference to circumstances then existing. I must, nevertheless, cite further the following wish expressed in one of the last sessions:

The Congress expresses the wish that:

1. The annual Peace Congress be held immediately before or immediately after the annual Interparliamentary Conference, and in the same city.
2. The different transactions and resolutions adopted respectively by the Congress and the Conference which are of a nature to be taken into consideration by the two assemblies, ought to be officially communicated by the one to the other.

(c) Third Congress, at Rome, in 1891.

The Italian peace societies took upon themselves the organization of the third Universal Congress, which opened at Rome the 11th of November, 1891, in the large hall of the Capitol, under the presidency of Ruggero Bonghi, a deputy and former minister, and continued its sessions until Saturday in the Palace of Fine Arts.

I shall not speak here of the reception nor of the entertainments which were brilliant. I must confine myself to a statement of the results obtained for the cause of peace, and as for the deliberations they have been reproduced entire in French, in the report of the Congress edited by Professor Cæsar Facelli and the Advocate, Antonio Teso, members of the peace committee of Rome.

The resolutions passed at this Congress may be classified under three heads, viz.:

1. Declarations of principles having reference to the juridical relations between peoples, to the solidarity of nations, the right of every people to dispose freely of itself, to the denial of the pretended right of conquest, to respect for the ethnographic character and development of nationalities.
2. The expression of wishes in reference to a more equitable division of the products of labor, to freedom of exchange, to arbitration between workmen, and between employers and workmen, to co-operative societies, to the conclusion of permanent arbitral treaties between peoples, to a solution by arbitration of the actually existing conflicts between States, to the establishment of an international tribunal for questions which governments may not succeed in resolving in a friendly way, and finally, to a proportional and simultaneous disarmament.

3. Propaganda in the interest of peace recommended to universities and schools, to societies of workmen and others, and also to the press, and carried out practically by the creation of an international Peace Bureau.

It may be boldly affirmed that the third Universal Peace Congress gave a strong impulse to the peace movement throughout the world by defining more clearly the ideas developed in the preceding Congresses and by giving to the societies a feeling of the strength which comes from their union, which does not necessitate, as has been clearly proven, the abandonment of any particular conviction outside of the great common principle of settling in a friendly way all international differences.

(d) Fourth Congress, at Berne, in 1892.

The fourth Congress, organized at Berne by the International Peace Bureau, in execution of a resolution of the third Congress, opened Monday, the 23d of August, in the hall of the Swiss National Council, under the presidency of Mr. Louis Ruchonnet, a member of the Federal Council. It lasted until the 27th of August.

It discussed, first, the organization of future Congresses, in reference to the representation from the societies, and on this point confined itself to expressing the wish in substance that the rules of the fourth Congress should serve as a basis for future meetings.

It then adopted articles of incorporation for the International Peace Bureau, which it established as a society having a legal existence under the Swiss federal code. It elected for the year the fifteen members of the Commission of the Bureau, approved the accounts of the Bureau, as well as the report of its proceedings and its budget.

It examined in a very thorough discussion the question of international arbitration, without, however, being able to form any resolutions elucidating the subject in all its bearings. The Commission of the Bureau was instructed to complete the study and to report to the fifth Congress.

One of the most noteworthy incidents of the Congress was the unanimous adoption of a proposition of the Baroness Von Suttner, Mr. Moneta and Mr. Capper looking toward the realization of the idea of a European federation. The resolution, enthusiastically approved, was in the following words:

"The Congress invites the European Peace Societies and their adherents to make a union of the European States, based upon the solidarity of their interests, the supreme aim of their propaganda, and invites all the societies of the world to insist, especially at the time of political elections, upon the necessity of establishing a permanent international tribunal, to which should be submitted every international difficulty, in order that all conflicts may be resolved by law and not by violence."

Declarations of principles were then adopted on the subjects:

1. Of the neutralization of isthmuses, straits and submarine cables traversed or used by commerce.
2. Of the policy of disarmament.
3. Of the consultation of legislative bodies before any declaration of war.
4. Of war loans.
5. Of the protection of foreigners.

As a chief means of propaganda the Congress decided upon a universal petition in favor of peace, leaving to the national committees, however, to draw up the petition for their several countries upon the basis of a general appeal to all nations, but keeping in view local circumstances.

We may say, in reference to this proposition, that such a work

requires time and its accomplishment necessitates earnest and prolonged effort. The friends of peace in Great Britain had already undertaken a petition asking for the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration with the United States of America. They have continued the circulation of the petitions, and have had the pleasure of seeing them returned with a million and a half of signatures, to which must be added also half a million declarations of approval given in the meetings of different societies. Thanks to the initiative of Mr. Frederic Bajer, Denmark has taken the lead with two hundred and thirty-four thousand signatures, and has set a noble example. Switzerland is engaged in the work, which is now well under way. France is just commencing and the circumstances there render the work somewhat difficult, but the last news from there received at the International Bureau is encouraging. Our friends in Italy seem to be as yet in a state of uncertainty as to how to proceed. The time is not ripe for a petition in Austria. Germany is passing through a political crisis which scarcely permits the pronounced advocates of peace and international arbitration to proceed at this time with a petition addressed to the parliament or the government.

A considerable number of other means of propaganda were presented at the fourth Congress, but time did not permit them to be discussed, so that the International Peace Bureau was instructed to study all the propositions and to execute as soon as possible all the measures recommended which it should judge useful and practical.

Finally the fourth Congress accepted by acclamation the invitation of our friends in America to hold the fifth Congress at Chicago in 1893.

3. INTERNATIONAL PEACE BUREAU.

To give an exact idea of the progress of the International Peace Bureau created at the third Congress, at Rome, and definitely constituted at the fourth Congress, at Berne, we can not do better than to refer you to the official report which includes the period from the 1st of December, 1891, to the 31st of March, 1893.

To complete this report we may say that all the labor which fell upon the Bureau in execution of the resolutions of the fourth Congress, a study of the propositions relating to propaganda, a study of the question of nationalities and preparation of the order of the day of the fifth Congress, are now completed. Besides this the Bureau has just published the first number of its monthly correspondence (a German edition), sent to five hundred political journals of Germany, Austria and a part of Switzerland, in order to bring to their knowledge the most important features of the peace movement in the two worlds. The expense of the edition has been met by the German Peace Societies, and any other societies may have editions in French, English and Italian by address-

ing the International Bureau to this effect as did our German friends. Since the last of March, 1893, the financial situation of the Bureau, set forth in the official report, has not changed.

4. INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES.

(a) First Conference, 1889, at Paris.

The 31st of October, 1888, chiefly through the labors of Mr. Frederic Passy and Mr. Henry Randal Cremer, a parliamentary conference of the members of the British and the French parliaments took place at Paris "with a view to securing the continuance of peaceful relations between Great Britain, the United States and France, by laboring for the establishment of treaties of arbitration between these three nations for the solution of difficulties which might arise between them."

Such was the origin of the Interparliamentary Conference, which has developed and brought nearer to its practical aim the conception of the Peace Societies and Congresses. These Conferences are to the Congresses what the Parliaments are to the peoples.

The Conference of the 31st of October, 1888, had in view a subsequent meeting in which not only members of Parliaments of the United States, Great Britain, and of France should take part, but also those of other Parliaments who were devoted to the principles of peace and arbitration.

This subsequent meeting took place at Paris during the Exposition, the 29th to 30th of June, 1889, under the presidency of Mr. Frederic Passy. France was represented in it by fifty-six senators and deputies, England by thirty-two members of the House of Commons, Italy by five senators and deputies, Spain, Belgium, Denmark and the United States by one member of the Senate or of the House; in all ninety-nine members of Parliaments.

The following are the resolutions adopted at this first Conference:

1. The members of the Interparliamentary Conference recommend anew and with urgency to all civilized governments the conclusion of treaties by which, without effecting their independence and without permitting any interference with what concerns their internal constitution, these governments may pledge themselves to submit to arbitration the settlement of all differences which may arise between them.

2. Wherever the circumstances shall appear favorable, as in the case of the United States and France, the United States and Italy, the United States and Spain, the governments and parliaments are earnestly invited to spare no efforts to promptly secure the conclusion of similar treaties. The Conference is convinced that if the example is once set it will soon be followed by other nations.

3. While waiting for the conclusion of permanent treaties embracing all cases the Conference expresses the wish that all special treaties of commerce, those pertaining to the rights of authors and other treaties may contain a special arbitral clause for their interpretation and execution.

4. The conduct of governments tending to be more and more only the expression of the ideas or sentiments of the body of the citizens, it is the

duty of electors to direct by their choice the policy of their country in the interests of justice, right and the brotherhood of peoples.

5. New Interparliamentary Conferences shall take place each year in some one of the countries represented in the Conference; the next meeting shall be held at London.

6. A committee composed of members of each nationality is authorized to organize the coming Conference, to send out invitations, to collect the necessary subscriptions, and in the mean time to put forth every effort to remove the misunderstandings which may arise by making an appeal, if necessary, to public opinion.

7. The members of the Interparliamentary Conference decide that the present members of Parliaments who have joined the Interparliamentary Conference, and who may not be re-elected, shall, nevertheless, take part in the subsequent meetings, since their co-operation will, doubtless, be very valuable in the advancement of the cause of Arbitration and Peace.

(b) Second Conference, at London, in 1890.

The second Interparliamentary Conference took place at London the 22d and 23d of July, 1890, under the presidency of Mr. Philip Stanhope, a member of the House of Commons.

England had in this conference seventy-five representatives, France, twenty-one, Germany, four, Norway, four, Holland, three, Italy, Belgium, Austria, Sweden and Greece, each one; in all one hundred and sixteen, with about seven hundred adherents, among whom were several ministers and presidents of European parliaments.

The resolutions passed at this second Interparliamentary Conference are as follows :

1. With a view to the maintenance of peace and friendly relations between the nations, the Interparliamentary Conference earnestly renews its wish in favor of the conclusion of treaties of arbitration by which, without interfering with their independence, the nations shall pledge themselves to submit to arbitration the solution of all differences which may arise between them. And where treaties of arbitration do not exist between nations in conflict the Interparliamentary Conference insists that the disputes should be settled by way of arbitration or mediation.

The members of the Conference pledge themselves, each in his own country, their individual and collective influence, in parliament and out of parliament, to secure the practical realization of the views and principles set forth in the preceding resolutions.

2. While waiting for the conclusion of general treaties of arbitration, the Conference recommends the insertion of arbitral clauses in treaties of commerce and in other treaties.

3. The Conference hails with satisfaction the adoption by the two Houses of Congress of the United States of a concurrent resolution in response to the address of the two hundred and thirty-four members of the English Parliament, asking the President to open up negotiations with the other Powers, with a view to the conclusion of arbitral treaties.

At the same time it congratulates the legislatures of the independent States of America, whose representatives recently adopted, in the Pan-American Congress, a form of arbitral treaty which now awaits the ratification of the respective governments.

4. The Conference rejoices to learn that efforts are being made at the present time to secure the conclusion of a treaty of arbitration between France and the United States. It congratulates the parliaments of Nor-

way, Spain and Italy on the adoption of resolutions in favor of the principle of arbitration, and it expresses the hope that other European countries may follow this example.

5. Considering that more intimate relations between the members of parliaments would exercise a great influence in establishing peace, the Conference recommends the creation in each country of a parliamentary committee to facilitate the exchange of ideas between them, and to examine causes of disagreement as soon as they appear.

6. A meeting of this Conference shall be held each year in one of the capitals. The next Conference shall be held at Rome.

7. A committee of thirty members, composed of deputies of each nation, to prepare for the coming Conference, and to adopt such measures as shall be necessary for the execution of the preceding program. The committee shall have power to add members of parliaments not represented in this Conference.

(c) Third Conference, in 1891, at Rome.

The third Interparliamentary Conference took place at Rome, from the 4th to the 7th of November, 1891, under the presidency of Mr. Biancheri, president of the Italian Chamber of Deputies. The number of representatives from different countries was still larger than at the second Conference. The program and the proceedings of this important meeting were chiefly the work of Mr. Biancheri and of the Marquis Pandolfi, who acted as secretary.

The text of the resolutions passed in this Conference is as follows :

1. The Conference, in the interest of justice and peace, expresses the wish that in future all the States having parliaments may be represented in all the International Congresses of the European Powers.

2. The Conference constitutes its annual Bureau as an international parliamentary committee, charged with adopting suitable measures for the pacific settlement of any conflict which may arise.

3. The Bureau, in order to give to the executive committee of the Conference of 1892 an effective co-operation, invites the members of parliament of each country to name a representative, who shall be charged with all correspondence between the executive committee of the Conference and the national parliamentary committees.

4. Noting with satisfaction that, in the majority of the nations, the fifth resolution of the London Conference has been put into execution, the Conference of Rome declares the urgent necessity of the foundation of parliamentary committees by the representatives of other countries.

5. The annual Conference shall be convened by the parliamentary committee of the country chosen as the place of the Conference.

Each parliamentary committee, furthermore, shall have the power to call a special Interparliamentary Conference. The call shall designate the place and object of meeting.

6. In order to facilitate the accomplishment of this duty or the exercise of this right by the parliamentary committees, the third Conference recognizes the necessity of a general secretaryship, which shall act as a depository and as a bureau of statistics and as a point of union, and serve as a bureau of information for all the parliamentary committees, and propose under their authority questions to be considered at the Conferences.

7. The direction of the secretaryship shall be entrusted to a general secretary, elected annually by the Conference. He shall be personally responsible for the administration of the general secretaryship.

8. The annual secretary shall have the privilege of establishing a central office in the city where he resides; but the office must be organized in such a manner as at any time to be transferred, with the necessary records and documents, to the parliamentary committee charged with calling together the ordinary Conferences, or to the one that shall think it necessary to call a special meeting.

9. The Conference invites the parliamentary committees of the Congress of 1892 to put upon the program of the Conference the subject of the organization of a court of arbitration.

(d) Fourth Conference, in 1892, at Berne.

At the fourth Interparliamentary Conference, which took place at Berne, Switzerland, from the 29th to the 31st of August, 1892, one hundred and seven members were present. Switzerland was represented by thirty-one, France by twenty-seven, Germany by twelve, Great Britain by nine, Roumania by seven, the Netherlands by five, Italy by four, Austria by four, Norway by three, Denmark by two, Spain and Portugal by one each, Honduras and San Salvador by one.

The address of welcome was given by Mr. Numa Droz, head of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and the presidential chair was occupied by Dr. Gobat, national councillor.

This Conference passed the following resolutions:

1. The Conference asks its members to try to induce the parliaments to which they belong to invite their governments to secure by an international conference the recognition of the principle of the inviolability of private property on the sea in time of war.

2. Recognizing that the arbitral clause in diplomatic treaties is the first step towards the negotiation of general treaties of arbitration between nations, whose adoption by all civilized States is desirable, the Conference invites its members to see that such a clause is inserted in treaties of commerce, of navigation, and for the protection of property, industrial, literary and artistic.

3. Considering that the United States of America have proposed the conclusion of arbitral treaties to the different Governments of civilized countries willing to form them; that arbitral treaties appear to be one of the most effective means of maintaining peace between the different nations of the world, the Conference resolves that the members of each of the parliaments represented in the Conference be invited to bring before the bodies of which they are members a motion that their respective Governments should accept the proposition of the United States relative to the formation of general treaties of arbitration between themselves and the countries willing to enter into such treaties.

5. INTERPARLIAMENTARY PEACE BUREAU.

Before adjourning, the fourth Interparliamentary Conference provided as follows for the organization of its permanent Bureau:

1. The Interparliamentary Conference for international arbitration is the organ of the groups of members of parliaments which have been constituted, or shall be constituted, to secure in their States by the way of general legislation or by means of special international treaties the recognition of the principle that differences between States should be submitted for settlement to arbitration, and also to treat of other international questions of general interest connected with the subject of arbitration.

2. It establishes a permanent central Bureau under the title of the Interparliamentary Bureau for International Arbitration. The seat of the Interparliamentary Bureau shall be at Berne.

3. The Interparliamentary Bureau shall be composed of not less than five nor more than ten members, chosen at each Conference from the different nationalities, the president of which shall be a member taken from the Swiss delegation and shall have delegated administrative powers.

4. The powers of the Interparliamentary Bureau for international arbitration are as follows:

It shall keep a record of the national parliamentary groups;

It shall hold correspondence with all the parliaments with a view to establishing in all countries national parliamentary groups;

It shall convoke the Interparliamentary Conferences and provide for the execution of the resolutions;

It shall be the general organ of the national parliamentary groups in everything which concerns their mutual relations;

It shall care for the archives and collect all documents relating to arbitration and peace;

In general, it shall take such means as are suited to the advancement of the object of the Interparliamentary Conference.

5. The expenses of the Interparliamentary Bureau shall be borne by the national groups in proportion to the population of the States to which they belong.

Thus constituted and entrusted to the care of Dr. Gobat, Councillor of State at Berne, the Interparliamentary Bureau, has entered into correspondence with the different national groups formed in the parliaments and has been very active in reducing to greater unity these hitherto somewhat loosely connected elements. It has arranged the preliminaries for the convocation and organization of the fifth Interparliamentary Conference which was to take place at Christiania, and the fact that this Conference has been postponed until next year is not to be attributed to the Bureau but to unexpected political changes. Its labors, however, have not been lost, for it has brought regularity into the relations of the groups and has drawn up an exact list of the members who have given their adherence to the principle of interparliamentary union.

The Bureau has established a monthly Review, the first number of which has just appeared, under the title of *The Interparliamentary Conference*, from which we extract the following declarations which are sufficient to explain its object:

“This journal is the organ of the Interparliamentary Union for international arbitration, an association composed of groups of members of parliaments which have been constituted or shall be constituted to secure in their States by the way of legislation or by means of special international treaties the recognition of the principle that the differences between States should be submitted for settlement to arbitration, and also to treat of other international questions of general interest connected with the subject of arbitration.

“As a tribune of the parliaments of Europe, our journal shall

keep up during the interval between our general meetings the connection between these bodies. In the Interparliamentary Union it shall be the heart whose pulsations shall go out to the borders of the great seas wherever we have adherents; thus a permanent bond shall be formed between the parliaments of Europe."

Having reached the end of the paper which I was asked to prepare upon the Peace Congresses and the International Bureau, and the Interparliamentary Conferences and their permanent organ, I feel some hesitation in presenting to you this article at once too long and too short; too long for a brief summary, too short to serve as a historical document. My excuse is found in the fact that the number of international peace meetings hitherto held is considerable, and that it was important at least to point out the progress of the peace movement in these great assemblies. I have gone farther with the Interparliamentary Conferences and reproduced the text of their resolutions because it seemed to me valuable to have collected together in one document the resolutions of the first four Conferences, heretofore found only in the annual reports. As to the decisions of the first four Universal Congresses they have been published in a systematized way by the International Peace Bureau.

Let me express in conclusion the wish that the fifth Universal Peace Congress at Chicago may add new elements of success to the work already commenced, by its harmony, by its unity and by its zeal in promoting the good cause.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I had handed to me, yesterday, another paper, by a gentleman from France, in French, but not in time to be translated. It is an account of the French "Ligue du Bien Public," by Mr. Potonié. It will appear, either in whole or in part, in the published proceedings of the Congress.

One of the rules of the World's Congress Auxiliary is that we shall not pass any resolution, that is, that there shall not be any voting, in the ordinary sense of the term. This rule was adopted to prevent jangling in the Congresses. We can easily see that the resolution was not intended for a peace congress. (Laughter.) It is our duty, since the World's Congress Auxiliary has tendered us these halls free of expense, to follow the rules of the Congress. We have decided, therefore, that a committee of ten or twelve persons be appointed to put what would have been the resolutions into the form of a statement, to be accepted at the close of the Congress. This committee will also be the Business Committee of the Congress.

CHAIRMAN QUINCY: The committee will be as follows: Dr. W. Evans Darby, Dr. Adolf Richter, Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Alfred H. Love, Rev. H. S. Clubb, Belva A. Lockwood, Dr. B. F. Trueblood, Gen. Charles H. Howard, Madame Nico Beck Meyer, Mary Louise Thomas and Mrs. H. J. Bailey.

Adjourned.

The following is a summary of the paper sent by Mr. Potonié.

The "Free Trade Association" was founded at Paris in 1846, after the model of the English "Anti-Corn-Law League." The Duke of Harcourt, Frédéric Bastiat, Hippolite Passy, Michel Chevalier, Ch. Coquelin, Denis and Leon Potonié, Joseph Garnier, Leon Say and others, members of this association, were among the first friends of peace in Europe.

Two years later, in 1848, these men joined Elihu Burritt and Henry Richard in organizing the first Peace Congress held on the Continent, which was followed by others in different capitals of Europe. The olive branch taken up by the Americans and the English in 1815 at the close of the bloody wars of Napoleon was to be carried finally over all the Old World.

In 1848 these men were joined by Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Duguerry, Coquerel, Bonnet, de Girardin and others. These men ought to be inscribed on the honor roll of the regenerated world.

The *Ligue Universelle du Bien Public* was founded in 1859. In 1848 the Republic had been proclaimed in France. On account of the troubles then existing it was impossible for Elihu Burritt and Henry Richard to organize a Peace Congress at Paris that year. They repaired to Brussels where the first Congress was held. The second was held at Paris in 1849, and the third at Frankfurt in 1850.

After 1851 the series of annual Peace Congresses was interrupted, Napoleon III. having uttered his famous saying: *L' Empire c'est la paix*. Eight years later Mr. Potonié, then at Berlin, proposed in a circular in English, French and German, to found a sort of permanent Congress by means of correspondence, under the auspices of the *Ligue du Bien Public*, which he then founded. The principles enunciated in the circular were

1. To extend the benefits of social science;
2. To combat monopolies and spoliations;
3. To point out the advantages of liberty of all kinds;
4. To preach peace.

Many prominent men in England, France and Germany responded to this appeal and became members of the *Ligue*,—Cobden, Richard, Hugo, Garibaldi, Passy, Jules Simon, Virchow, Desmoulins, Dolfus and others. It was these men who gave the impulse to the Peace Movement on the Continent of Europe, a movement which will never cease, a movement becoming every year stronger by the formation of new societies.

The *Ligue du Bien Public* has continued its "Cosmopolitan Correspondence" for thirty-four years, many journals having published some of its articles. It was the first Continental Peace Society to publish, in 1866, a plan for an international tribunal of arbitration, drawn up by Mr. Noble of Brighton. The plan is as follows:

1. The tribunal shall be entitled "International Tribunal of Arbitration," or "Supreme Court of Nations."

2. It shall be composed of two representatives from each of the nations recognizing its jurisdiction, chosen from among the wisest and most experienced statesmen, and receiving a suitable compensation.

3. These representatives shall be named respectively by the different governments, and shall have the power to declare war and conclude peace.

4. The tribunal shall meet periodically at Paris, at London, or successively in other capitals, and shall have full power to make the rules for its own government.

5. The members of the tribunal shall be named annually, or at longer intervals, and shall form a permanent court which shall meet whenever its services are needed.

6. One of its first duties, evidently, will be to revise international law, establishing it on principles more satisfactory and more generally recognized.

7. The jurisdiction of the tribunal shall be limited to the relations of nations with one another. The principle of non-interference in their internal affairs shall be rigorously observed. Further, it shall interfere in case of a difference only after all negotiations for an amicable arrangement shall have failed. Then the offended nation shall appeal to its arbitration, instead of declaring war.

8. The meetings of the tribunal shall be public, and the questions submitted to it shall be decided by a majority of the votes of the judges present.

9. In the different questions submitted to it for decision the representatives of the nations interested shall never sit as judges. They shall simply act as counsel for their respective governments.

10. Each nation represented in the tribunal shall contribute its proportional part of the general expenses. The salaries of the representatives shall be paid by their respective governments.

11. In case a nation should refuse to submit to a decision rendered by the court, the other powers shall immediately suspend diplomatic relations with it. The honor of all the nations represented in the tribunal shall be pledged to maintain its authority. Every act of war committed contrary to its decrees shall be considered an act of piracy.

This project of Mr. Noble is of interest now when many similar plans are being elaborated.

The *Ligue* is to-day publishing "flying leaves," under the title of *Petits Plaidoyers contre la guerre* (Little Arguments against War), which are sent for reproduction to 1500 journals. The principles of the *Ligue* from the beginning have been these :

1. No more standing armies ;
2. No more indirect taxes ; no more customs tariffs ;
3. No more monopolies ;
4. Liberty of every kind ;
5. Separation of Church and State ;
6. International arbitration ;
7. Universal education ;
8. Free litigation ;
9. Inviolability of human life ; abolition of the death penalty ;
10. *Si vis pacem para justitiam.*

THIRD SESSION.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15TH, 3 P. M.

The Congress reassembled in the Hall of Washington at 3 P. M.

The Divine blessing was invoked by Rev. C. Perren, of Chicago.

CHAIRMAN QUINCY: The first paper on our program this afternoon is by David Dudley Field, whom we are all acquainted with as one of the ablest expounders of international law and advocates of arbitration. Mr. Field's great age — he is now eighty-eight years old, — keeps him from being present in person with us this afternoon, but the paper which he has kindly prepared will be read by John T. Dorland, of London.

The paper of Mr. FIELD was as follows:

KARNAK AND CARTHAGE; OR THE WASTE AND THE RECOIL OF AGGRESSIVE WAR.

GENTLEMEN — You ask me to write something for your Congress about war and peace. I can write but little, but that you shall have; and I begin with describing two of the most striking monuments which war has left upon the face of the earth, Karnak and Carthage; monuments of ancient wars; the heroic past, advocates of war would say, monuments of the barbaric past, say the advocates of peace. Let us make them the texts of a lesson for our generation. There are other like lessons, in different parts of the world, it is true. the heaps of buried walls and temples in Troy, Palmyra and Babylon, but the one on the bank of the Nile and the other on a bay of the Mediterranean, will suffice for a beginning.

Who can look on Karnak without admiration for the magnitude of its proportions, the stateliness of its obelisks, and the beauty of its porticoes and columns. As I sat years ago, in the shadow of these structures beautiful in ruin, and looked on the great river flowing silently before them, and the desolate plain beyond, I had a more vivid sense, than I had ever felt before, of that awful scourge of war, which had wrought this desolation and driven out a sturdy and polished race to bring in the inert and impoverished fellaheen. I recall the description in Rasselas of the "Father of Waters, whose bounty poured down the stream of

plenty and scattered over half the world the harvests of Egypt," and then I shut my eyes to bar out the prospect before me, and to imagine the stories which this Father of Waters could tell if there were a voice to speak, of the marvels which the inhabitants of the valley had wrought in the arts of war and peace, and of the swarming millions, who had labored and danced and sung beside the stream. Why then, I thought, are so many of these pillars broken and fallen into the dust? Read the story of Egyptian kings and Egyptian wars, and you will see. It is not a long story. History was written in those days on the pyramids, obelisks and leaves of papyrus, meagre and void of details. But this we know, that Karnak was despoiled in the savage tumult of war.

With these reflections still in his mind, let the traveller sail down the river, and along the southern coast of the Mediterranean, until he reaches a heap of ruins and is told: There is what remains of ancient Carthage, the rival of Rome. There lies the barbaric monument of the most barbaric destruction of a single city, that the earth has ever beheld. When the cry went up in the Roman Senate, "*delenda est Carthago*," Carthage was a great and flourishing city, full of the treasures of commerce and of art. The tide of war flowed back and forth across the Mediterranean, the flood turning off to the ebb, and the ebb afterwards to the flood, until at last a Scipio drew his ploughshare over the ruins of Carthage and sowed the furrows with salt.

What did these barbarities signify? The destructive impulses in the bosom of man. A human being seems to have two opposite natures warring within him; one that of an angel, the other that of a demon. Who but one possessed by a demon could commit the atrocities of Karnak and Carthage? And what do they teach, but the folly of alternately building and destroying as men do. What is gained by war is in the end lost by war. We verify age by age the fable of Sisyphus, rolling his stone to the top of the mountain only to see it roll back, and then to roll it up again. Men labor with all their strength and skill to build great cities and splendid monuments, to encourage learning, peaceful industry and gentle manners. Then the evil spirit is roused to tear down what others have built. A tyrant from the Euphrates or the Tigris swoops down upon the Nile; a Roman general effaces Carthage; a Mohametan caliph burns the Alexandrian library; and so the world has gone on, building up and pulling down, as if on purpose to prevent a permanent advancement of the race.

Who can tell what the world might have gained, if Carthage and Rome had been peaceful rivals in the pursuits of commerce and the arts? All the coasts of the Mediterranean from the haven of Tyre to the pillars of Hercules might have seen only flourishing cities and fruitful fields. Nay, it might have been possible for the bold navigators who manned the ships of Tarshish

to push their adventures westward into the great and formidable sea beyond the Azores, and anticipate by two thousand years the discoveries of Columbus.

■ If there be, as I believe there is, a moral government of the world, it is impossible that the Supreme Ruler of all things should look with complacency upon the maiming and killing of those whom He has made a little lower than the angels, the destruction of their habitations and of the fruits of their labors. It must be, that at some time and in some way He will manifest His displeasure and punish the transgressors. Indeed we have the express admonition of Christ himself: "Put up again thy sword into his place. for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." I wish that some competent historian would undertake to show by examples how nearly this prediction has been fulfilled. For myself, I can do no more than refer, and that most briefly, to some of the principal wars since the beginning of the Christian era.

I confine my observations to aggressive war. Far be it from me to think that a nation should not defend itself by force, if need be, against force. If I had lived when Bourgoyne invaded my country, I would have joined in resisting him by force until he was disarmed at Saratoga. If I had been a Russian when Napoleon marched into the north, with fire and sword, I would have helped march him out through snow and ice across the Bersina, to the farther bank of the Nieman. I would have done these things, as I would resist a burglar in my chamber, or a ruffian on the highway. I believe in using force to resist force, whether of burglar or invader. There are bullies among nations as there are bullies among individuals, and I would treat them alike. There is small need however of discussing this question, since if aggressive war were so discountenanced as to be next to impossible, there would be no occasion for defensive war, and so I am against all aggressive war whatever.

Not far from the time when the memorable words of Christ, that I have quoted, were uttered, Augustus was Emperor of Rome. On his death, his testament was read in the Senate, by which, Gibbon tells us, "He bequeathed as a valuable legacy to his successors, the advice of confining the Empire within those limits which nature seemed to have placed, as its permanent bulwarks and boundaries; on the west, the Atlantic Ocean; the Rhine and Danube on the north; Euphrates on the east; and towards the south, the sandy deserts of Arabia and Africa." But from that time to the reign of Trajan, the imperial city not only held, but extended its conquests. Thence forward however, the tide began to turn; disaster followed disaster, until Alaric four hundred years later assaulted and took possession of Rome, and though the Byzantine empire held out a thousand years later, it held out amid a series of conflicts, during which the human race seemed

recoiling to barbarism. The aggressions of the Romans upon the Germans and the Gauls brought on in the end that great human tide which

“The populous north poured * * * from her frozen loins to pass
Rhine or the Danaw, when her barbarous sons
Came like a deluge on the south and spread
Beneath Gibraltar to the Libyan sands.”

Then came the Crusaders to recover the Holy Sepulchre. For two hundred years, with now and then an interval, the kings of Jerusalem held sway in Palestine from Egypt to Lebanon. Where now is the kingdom of Jerusalem? Swallowed up as a drop of rain in the sea. Where is the great Moslem Empire itself which at one time threatened the Christian West? Turned back upon Asia and even now only halting before it recrosses the Bosphorus.

Coming down to modern days, let us ask what was gained by the religious wars following the Reformation, more than could have been gained by moderation and peace? There were atrocities on both sides. Tilly is a synonym for horrors. On the other side nurses in Southern Germany even now quiet their babes with the whisper, “Hush, the Swedes are coming.” What did France gain by the perfidy of Louis the XIV. in seizing Strasburg, during a profound peace? In a publication of that time, I remember the letter of an English statesman, in which he concluded an account of this act of the French king, with expressing the hope that Europe would never rest until the stolen city had been restored to Germany. Where is Alsace-Lorraine now? I am not considering the question whether its forced recession was justifiable or wise, for it must be borne in mind, that times have greatly changed since Louis the XIV., and that the people of a country now have something to say about the transfer of their allegiance from one power to another, as if they were merely pawns on the chess-board to be moved according to the skill or want of skill of the players.

What did the war which England waged against her American colonies gain for England? The dismemberment of her empire, and the humiliation of signing with Franklin the treaty of Versailles. What did France gain by her persistent hostility to England? The chagrin of seeing her enemy profit by the war, to gain provinces and islands east and west, in every part of the globe. What did the conquests of Napoleon on the continent of Europe gain for France at the last? The bloody Beresina, the occupation of Paris, and the humiliation of Waterloo. What did the third Napoleon gain for France, by the Franco-German War? Let her receded provinces, her burden of taxation, and the ever-increasing armaments of Europe give answer.

The standing armies of Europe at this time, according to the Statesman's Year-Book for 1893, are computed as follows, the men in arms, including officers, being classed as the Regular Army, the reserves as effective. In Germany the Regular Army

amounts to 511,744 men, the effective to 2,234,631; Italy, Regular Army, 247,809, effective, 3,029,874; Russia, Regular Army, 1,024,150, effective, 3,115,556; Great Britain, Regular Army, 238,320, effective 627,336; France, Regular Army, 515,375, effective, 3,750,000; Austria-Hungary, Regular Army, 326,031, effective, 1,753,583; Turkey, Regular Army, 700,620; Netherlands, Regular Army, 22,875, effective, 69,000; Spain, Regular Army, 115,735, effective, 1,083,595; Denmark, Regular Army, 42,950, effective, 60,000; Sweden, Regular Army, 325,535; Norway, Regular Army, 35,900. The reserves in Germany do not include the landsturm. Without counting these, the number of men now under arms, including officers, appears to be 4,107,045, while the reserves, number 16,344,574. What an awful spectacle! The increase in the public debts of the following countries since 1870 has been as follows: Italy from 483 to 576 million pounds sterling, Austria from 340 to 580 million pounds sterling, Russia from 340 to 750, France from 500 to 1300. The government debts of the European world in 1870, according to a statement of Sir John Lubbock, in the English House of Commons, amounted to four billion pounds, and in 1893 to six billion pounds. How long can this process last?

So after all the wars, by which men have torn one another in pieces, what do we see? Europe converted into a vast camp; millions of men in arms; fortresses and munitions of war built and furnished without number; public debts increased beyond all parallel, and citizens awaiting breathless, the tocsin for the battle of Armageddon, prophesied of old, when, as we are told in Holy Writ, "The spirits of devils go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." It would be idle for any man, and most of all for an American, to speculate on the probable results of the impending conflict. We may be certain only that an awful carnage and a frightful destruction of property will ensue. The map of Western Europe may not be changed, but Eastern Europe is ripe for revolution; and if that shall bring the resurrection of Poland, a constitutional government for Russia, and the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, all will not be lost. But, when will men learn, that while all war is wasteful, few things recoil so surely and so terribly as aggressive war.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Mr. Quincy, our chairman, is called to Washington and has to return this evening, so he has been compelled to withdraw. We all very much regret this. I will ask Dr. Darby to take the chair for the remainder of this session. Sir Joseph Pease, President of the London Peace Society, was to have presided one session, but since he is not here we will ask Dr. Darby to take the chair.

DR. DARBY: I appreciate, ladies and gentlemen, the honor of presiding over this assembly, and the dual honor of

occupying the place both of our distinguished president, Mr. Quincy, and of Sir Joseph Pease, whom I would be glad to see here. Our Secretary will announce the next paper.

THE SECRETARY: The next paper on the program is by Hon. Angelo Mazzoleni, Milan, Italy. The paper is a statistical one, and as we shall have the pleasure this afternoon of having an address from the World's Fair Commissioner from Italy, Signor Victor Zeggio, I propose to submit this paper without reading it. The paper, which is extremely valuable, will appear in full in the printed report of the Congress.

MR. MAZZOLENÍ's paper is as follows:

DESTRUCTION OF MEN AND MATERIAL LOSSES.

WAR STATISTICS.

The war problem in its direct relations with all the manifestations of social life must be studied in politics, legislation, moral education and public economy.

In politics, it is necessary to substitute for the selfishness and rivalries, now existing among nations, the principles of solidarity and reciprocity in the general interests of peace and civil progress;¹ hence the collective work especially of the national parliaments and of the interparliamentary conference in favor of this civil regeneration in the relations between States.

In legislation, it is necessary to substitute for the law based on violence, or in other words, the law of the strongest, a new juridical principle, for the States in their reciprocal relations to formulate into legislative rules, internationally accepted. In this work legislatures and jurists must co-operate to secure the establishment of the new law of peoples.²

It would be useful for the development of the new law of nations if at the universities special courses were opened for the theoretical and practical study of arbitration as a constant rule of law in all questions amongst nations actually pending or in view.

The principle of arbitration must be spread abroad so as to enter the public conscience, that it may become the fundamental part of the political constitutions of States.

In education, the problem is to give, in the schools, such training as will create amongst young people the sentiment of respect and fraternity towards the populations beyond the frontiers marked by political geography, and will lead them to consider all as a part of the one great human family and society, within which impulses, alike and yet different, are to develop the full activity of each nation.³ This is the special work of teachers, the most important part of which is assigned to women in the family and the social

sphere.⁴ In public economy, we ought to substitute for custom houses on the frontiers, for industrial conflicts, for monopolies and the leagues of resistance of workmen against employers a method by which the interests of all may be equitably met. Hence, in such difficult and varied matters it is important that we should have the help of all the students of the social welfare in order to obtain all that is practically possible, a better economical balance and a more just division of the profits of labor.⁵ The solution of the so-called social question is intimately connected with the problem of the universal pacification implied in it.

The fifth Congress has very opportunely, in its list of topics, proposed the discussion of war under all its aspects and, therefore, deserves the praise of all the civilized world.

As we have demonstrated in a recent publication,⁶ war not offering, of itself, a judicial solution, ought in justice to be condemned in advance as the legalization of violence and brutal force. War, if once admitted as right in principle, would be perennial, because the treaties of peace derived from it, having been imposed by the victor, are not agreements freely entered into, but an armed truce of greater or less duration, until the vanquished feels that he can again try the fortunes of war with better chance of success.

War being condemned from the social and economical standpoint, the question arises, what is the proper way to resolve the conflicts, of various kinds, that will arise even between the most civilized nations when their political and economical interests are invaded.

And it is here that the most difficult and positive part of our labors comes in, that of giving to States another juridical organization, of making arbitration the foundation of public law as it was proclaimed to be at Washington in the memorable treaty of April, 1890.

In reference to the promotion of arbitration, in its largest application to all sorts of conflicts, at present the most valuable work the friends of peace can do would be to secure the united action of all parliaments on this subject.⁷

The fifth Congress, if it succeeds in furnishing a clue to the solution of the questions left over from previous ones, and does not simply repeat the action of these, will furnish valuable assistance in the performance of the task which each one of us proposes to himself in order to overcome the difficulties of various kinds which yet hinder our movement.

Confining myself to topic (a) of the third section of the program, I present, in this paper, a statistical account of the material and moral evils of war, using, by preference, France as an illustration, which, partly from her character and partly because of the political events in which she has been involved, ap-

pears to be the most agitated nation in Europe and the most bent on military enterprises.

Doctor Lagneau, President of the Anthropological Society in Paris, in a recent work, very highly spoken of, gives the statistics of the destruction of life caused in France by the Napoleonic wars.

In the period from 1791 to 1800, 2,080,000 men were enrolled. In the census of 1800 there remained of these but 667,598. In ten years about 1,400,000 soldiers disappeared. From 1800 to 1814, 4,556,000 soldiers were called into service without counting the enlistment of foreigners, and these men, in the flower of their youth, went to carry destruction and to leave their corpses scattered in almost all the countries of Europe.

The campaign of Russia alone cost France 450,000 men, of whom 125,000 died on the battlefield, 132,000, by cold, hunger and suffering, and 193,000 remained prisoners. Of an army of half a million of men, horrible to say, only 50,000 returned to France. At Waterloo France lost thirty to forty thousand soldiers and the allied forces fifteen thousand out of 144,000 combatants.

According to the great French economist, J. B. Say, the war expenses during the first empire, from 1800 to 1814, exceeded five billions of francs, to which must be added five billions more sustained by France in the way of contributions and general losses.

From 1815 to 1851 France had a period of comparative peace; but, in 1852, she entered on a new war period, including the Crimean, Italian and the Cochin China wars, and, to conclude with, the immense catastrophe of 1870-1871.

The campaign of Italy (1859), notwithstanding the bloody battles of Palestro, Magenta and Solferino, was relatively less destructive, because of its shortness, the good season and the fertility of the soil on which it was fought.

Of the effective of about 300,000 men, there were 10,500 slain and almost an equal number of deaths in the hospitals and ambulances.

The enterprises of Mexico, China and Cochin China cost France an average of 35,000 men lost each year during four years of war. The war of 1870-1871 cost France half a million of victims, and the loss of twenty billions. The particulars of the great battles of Gravelotte, of Metz and Sedan are most horrible. It is reported that some days after the catastrophe of Sedan it was necessary, with coal oil, to destroy human corpses in 1986 trenches, and those plains of death were covered by so many victims that engineers were forced to have recourse to the most powerful disinfectants for 899 mounds and 350 trenches, containing more than 10,000 corpses.

From statistical notes, which we have reason to believe true,

without guaranteeing the accuracy of the manner in which military statistics are compiled, the losses of men and money in the last wars are as follows : ⁸

Crimean War (1854-1856).

Losses.	Men.	Money
By France,	95,615	fr. 1,600 millions
“ England,	22,182	“ 1,855 “
“ Piedmont,	2,194	“ 53 “
“ Turkey,	35,000	“ 400 “
“ Russia,	30,000	“ 3,183 “
Total	184,991	fr. 7,091 millions

Besides the 30,000 men killed on the battlefield, Russia lost 600,000 more by sickness and suffering in the long and hard marches before arriving on the battlefield.

Italian War (1859).

Losses.	Men.	Money.
By Austria,	38,650	fr. 375 millions
“ France,	17,775	“ 635 “
“ Piedmont,	6,575	“ 255 “
Totals	63,000	fr. 1,265 millions

Danish War (1864).

Losses.	Men.	Money.
By Denmark,	1,500	fr. 180 millions
“ Prussia,	1,048 }	Represented by
“ Austria,	952 }	war indemnities.

War between Prussia and Austria (1866).

Losses.	Men.	Money.
By Prussia,	11,000	fr. 400 millions
“ Austria,	25,000	“ 600 “
“ Italy,	6,000	“ 400 “
“ Small States,	3,000	“ 250 “
Totals,	45,000	fr. 1,650 millions

Distant Expeditions (1861-1867).

Mexico, China, Cochin China, Lebanon, 65,000 men lost and 1000 millions spent.

Turkey—Africa.

The Turkish wars involved a loss of 250,000 men and an expense of four billions; the South-African wars cost 30,000 men and 35 millions; the war in Afghanistan 230,000 men and 53 millions of marks.

FRANCO-GERMAN WAR (1870-1871).

This war cost France the loss of so many victims and so many billions that it ought to be illustrated with statistical data by both

the belligerent parties, data which have not been compiled in exact tables; we wish somebody would compile them, because this would be the most eloquent confutation of the partisans of a new war of the formidable proportions which it would assume, because of the increased means of offence and the gigantic armies which would engage in it, spreading ruin and destruction in three-quarters of Europe.

Here we remark, that in the military statistics are shown, generally, merely those slain in battle and not the number, far more important, of those who died by wounds and maladies and of the men rendered unable to work by amputations or by loss of health in military campaigns.

Spain, in the Napoleonic wars from 1811 to 1814, out of 61,512 combatants had 8889 killed on the field and 24,930 by disease and exhaustion.

In the Crimea, out of 309,268 Frenchmen who took part in that expedition, more than 20,000 fell in battle and 74,000 died in the hospitals and ambulances.

In the Italian war, the Franco-Sardinian army, notwithstanding the favorable conditions of the land, lost 24,350 on the field of battle, while one hundred thousand men were disabled by disease.

In the successive wars between Prussia and Austria, in 1866, and between France and Germany, in 1870-1871, the losses of men through diseases contracted during the campaign, equal two-thirds of the number of those who fell on the battlefield. To record the disastrous effects of these wars, in their moral and social aspects, volumes would be needed. War, which is neither useful nor necessary, as we have demonstrated in another publication,⁹ is stupendous folly on the part of our century, which unjustly proclaims itself civilized; it will disappear from the legally-established customs of nations as other institutions condemned by civil morality have disappeared.

Meanwhile, it is very painful to see Europe employ two-thirds of her income in the suicidal and unproductive business of war, while only a third is divided up for the other services, which have to do with all the life and prosperity of nations.

Now what an immense advantage would the European States derive if the billions so unproductively wasted for military purposes, which impoverish the populations, were spent in works of public utility, in increasing production in each country, in ploughing and fertilizing lands; in constructing canals, in draining marshes and in the general improvement of lands; how much the causes of social disturbance would be lessened, how many miseries would be suppressed, how many afflictions and privations avoided!

It has been calculated that the cost of the greatest international enterprises of the century, the Panama railroad, the Suez canal,

the cutting of the Mt. Cenis tunnel, the Andes railroad, does not exceed all told two billion and a half of francs, or only half of what France paid to Germany as a war indemnity for the campaign of 1870-1871.

And yet we, in Europe, are witnesses of this strange phenomenon of international perversion, that, while a future war is considered such a calamity that every government does all in its power not to provoke it, in order to avoid the odious responsibility, yet all the States, well knowing that it means their economical ruin, vie with each other in augmenting their armaments and in preparing more deadly means of attack, in order, they say, to meet the eventuality of a war which is detested by everybody, but for which all declare they must be ready. "At the present moment," wrote Jules Simon, "all the peoples are employing their money to prepare all their men for a war of which they all are in dread, and which they all hold in horror."

It is a frenzy of armaments, and if reason does not prevail, militarism will, unfortunately, bringing with it the financial collapse of Europe and reducing her to utter ruin perhaps for generations to come.

Many are of the opinion that a war would be the best means of putting an end to the present difficulties and the present armaments.

After a great war fought on such a gigantic scale, Europe, they say, would remain so prostrated in her strength that a general disarmament would as a result be imposed on her. War, we answer, being no real solution of a conflict, will be perennial until, in its stead, general rules of law are adopted for the regulation of the intercourse of State with State, and until the contending parties come to submit their differences to the judgment of third parties not interested in the dispute.

Those who are thus deluded do not stop to consider what a war will be in which such perfected projectiles will be used, and the means of destruction will be so powerful as to render the ambulances useless impediments, and the sanitary service insufficient to give the necessary assistance to the victims riddled by grape shot at a distance of several miles.¹⁰ And who can tell the new scientific surprises, and what infernal machines of destruction the art of war will, in the future, create?

To be ready for the great war, Europe keeps under arms, now, almost eight millions of men on a peace footing, and fourteen millions more in the second line, spending, in the ordinary budgets a sum of more than four billions of francs, which is still further increased by the extras, interests and sinking funds.

France since the war of 1870-1871 has spent nearly two billion three hundred millions for the renewal of her war equipment alone, without including the ordinary army and navy budgets of about twelve millions more. All the other powers have increased

since 1871 their budgets and their effective contingents, it may be safely said, in about the same proportions.

Germany disposes to-day of an army of 2,960,000 men in the first line, or about five per cent. of the population, and yet, for the Emperor William this is not enough, and the Reichstag having rejected, last May, his proposed plan for the increase of the army, it was dissolved.¹¹

From a recent publication of Captain Molard, we know that in the last twenty years the military powers of the European States have increased the effectiveness of their military forces in the following proportions :

France, 1,150,000 men ; Germany, 1,117,000 ; Russia, 1,350,000 ; Austria, 300,000 ; Italy, 944,000, and the other minor States in proportion. England alone has not entered on this dangerous path ; she is the only power which has not been afraid to remain, in point of armaments, behind even Turkey and Spain. In fact, England, which had in 1869 an army of 450,000 men, had reduced it in 1892 to 342,000, though her material prosperity had greatly increased.

To complete the picture, it will be useful to take a rapid survey of the sea forces. The statistics of the European fleets, according to the last reports, give to France forty-nine armored ships, against eighty-one that are at the disposal of the Triple Alliance. The French fleet counts fifty-eight warships, while the Triple Alliance has ninety-seven, which united to the English will make 242.

The French possess, moreover, 190 Torpedo boats ; the Triple Alliance, 400 ; to which if those of England be added the number will be 571.

Supposing the French fleet allied to the Russian, the respective forces will be : 109 armored men-of-war of the Franco-Russian fleet, against eighty-one of Germany, Austria and Italy united ; eighty-three Cruisers of the Franco-Russian, against ninety-seven of the allies.

All these fleets, of the approximate value of 5,565,000 frs., do not represent the entire marine outlay, because every year new expenses are made necessary by the continual efforts of the States to outdo each other on land and sea by applying the latest scientific discoveries to the production of the most powerful means of defence and destruction.

To the account of the armies and navies, we ought to set down the European public debt, which amounts to 117 billions of francs, increased by the interest and the expenses for the sinking funds.

In this dreadful column of figures, that indicates the impoverishment of the nations, the respective contingents are as follows :

France . . .	31 billions	Russia . . .	18 billions
England . . .	17 “	Italy . . .	11 “
Austria . . .	9 “	Germany . .	10 “
U. S. A. . .	10 “		

In 1890, the budgets of army and navy and the debts of the various States were as follows :

States.	Population.	Peace effective Men.	War effective Men.	Debts Billions.	General Budget Millions	War and Marine Millions.
Germany,	45,000,000	515,000	2,520,000	5.5	2,500	750
Austria,	38,000,000	325,000	1,150,000	10.5	2,000	350
Turkey,	22,000,000	150,000	620,000	6.	360	120
Italy,	28,000,000	265,000	1,100,000	10.5	1,600	325
England,	35,250,000	335,000	(?)	19.5	2,300	830
Spain,	10,000,000	200,000	450,000	13.	900	165
France,	38,000,000	520,000	2,450,000	26.5	3,485	950
Russia,	100,000,000	715,000	2,500,000	8.5	3,110	850
U. S. A.,	64,000,000	26,000	3,000,000	6.	3,845	65

In the above table the minor States of Europe are not represented ; their peace effectives are as follows : Holland, 65,753 ; Belgium, 45,405 ; Denmark, 42,909 ; Roumania, 35,413 ; Sweden and Norway, 33,020 ; Bulgaria, 32,346 ; Greece, 26,346 ; Portugal, 24,361 ; Servia, 13,243.

To finish the subject, it remains to speak of the material losses caused by war through the devastation and damages to private property, not only in the belligerent States but in the surrounding nations whose interests are always profoundly disturbed during hostilities and after the war. Here it is very difficult to collect statistics, because to the damages usually reckoned such we ought to add those for indemnity, for reconstruction of public works, bridges, roads, canals, manufactures, etc. At any rate, even with incomplete data, such statistics would be useful as an inducement to the governments to come to international agreements to guarantee public and private property in time of war, as long as this fearful inheritance of the past, war, shall continue to cast its blight over the nations.

It is a matter of congratulation that the fourth Interparliamentary Conference last August, in Berne, made an appeal to all members of parliaments to try to induce their governments to have recognized, through a Conference, the principle of the right of nations to the inviolability of private property at sea in time of war.

It is a happy circumstance that the different parliaments have, since, with a solemn vote, confirmed the civil principle of private inviolability in time of war.¹²

Thus, upon the motion of Mr. Gobat, president of the fourth Interparliamentary Conference, at Berne, the Swiss Council of State by a unanimous vote, adopted a resolution to invite the Federal Council to take the initiative for an international convention like that of Geneva in 1864, to protect in time of war the build-

ings devoted to religion, public instruction, libraries and artistic and scientific collections.¹³

Gentlemen — As statistical work, like that of the present paper, needs, in a special manner, the assistance and co-operation of all Peace Societies, they ought all to help, as far as possible, in furnishing the data and material to the International Bureau at Berne, together with the means for its compilation and publication.¹⁴

With this in view, I have the honor to move the following resolution :

“The fifth Congress, having taken cognizance of the reports presented on the destructiveness of war from the economic point of view, believes that it would be very advantageous to the peace propaganda if an effective demonstration of the ruinous character of war should be made by means of carefully prepared statistics, to which the widest possible circulation should be given.

“The Congress, therefore, invites and urges the Peace Societies and adherents to the cause, to put at the disposal of the International Bureau at Berne suitable statistical material, and to assist by special contributions in meeting the expenses necessary to the accomplishment of such an important service.”¹⁴

The resolution I have the honor to propose was suggested by the declaration made by Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, last year in Berne (22d of August, 1892), in favor of the institution of the International Bureau, and its special services.

The compilation and publication of such military statistics would enlighten the masses as to the expenses caused by war and standing armies. These statistics would likewise show the enormous cost in money and the economical exhaustion of the people in keeping up the land and naval forces ; the time and labor lost to agricultural and industrial enterprise ; the immense number of strong and vigorous men enrolled for the military service ; the disasters, diseases and mortality which are its consequences ; the widows and orphans ruined by no fault of their own, and exposed, without means, to all moral and intellectual wants ; and that other abominable fruit of war, the miserable spectacle of a large number of vagabonds and parasites living at the expense of honest and peaceful citizens.

Furthermore, the statistics which are proposed would enlighten governments and legislators and indicate to them that in the present great light of progress and civilization there are better means, less expensive, and more durable, for settling international controversies than to have recourse to war.

These statistics would demonstrate in a positive manner how war and the military spirit, being the barbarous relic of past ages, will disappear from the customs of civilized and Christian peoples. They would also demonstrate that every question of whatsoever

nature can sooner or later be settled in a satisfactory way by means of a reconciliation or an arbitral decision.¹⁵

NOTES.

1 See subject VII. of the topics of the program and the report of the International Bureau in Berne regarding nationalities.

2 See subject VI. of the topics of the program. In Europe this work is carried on by "The Institute of International Law" established in Belgium, 1873. The most illustrious jurists of all countries are members of this.

3 For the school "Propaganda" it would be useful to notice the Model Chapter for the primary schools, of which Mr. Seve is the author, this being the chapter to which the prize was awarded in the contest opened by The International Arbitration and Peace Association. It is published in French and English.

4 See subject IV. of the program, "Woman and War" (a, b, c).

5 See subject VIII. of the program, "Conflicts between Capital and Labor."

6 *La guerre est-elle necessaire?* Berne, 1892.

7 See subject V. of the program. It would be very desirable if in all the parliaments were formed governmental committees on peace and arbitration, who shall be in correspondence with each other, and having for a centre of action the Interparliamentary Conferences whose decisions they shall execute.

8 In the table which follows we limit ourselves to the wars fought in Europe or between far distant countries and European States.

9 *La guerre est-elle necessaire?* Berne, 1892.

10 We recall the observation of the illustrious military surgeon, Billroth, to the Austrian Parliament in a memorable speech, December, 1891, quoted in a note on page 34 of the pamphlet "*La guerre est-elle necessaire?*" Berne, 1892.

11 In the general elections, June 15, 1893, Germany had to express her opinions on the increase of the military expenses.

12 In Roumania, January 30, 1893, the Senate on the motion of Senator Strechia; and the fourth of April following in the Chamber, on the motion of Deputy Ciuflea; in the first and second Chamber of the Netherlands; in March last in the parliament of Denmark, on the motion of the Hon. Blutime, a member of the Interparliamentary Conference.

13 It would be desirable that the convention extend its protection also to the great works having an international character and to the constructions in which two or more nations have joined.

14 It will be very useful to compile statistical tables for the use of the peace Societies, like those of the Liverpool Society.

15 Memoir of Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, corresponding secretary of the Washington branch of The Universal Peace Union, on the functions of the International Peace Bureau, note IX., page 214, in the Report of the fourth Peace Congress at Berne, 1892.

THE SECRETARY then read the following paper sent by E. T. Moneta, President of the Lombard Peace Union. The reading was attended with frequent applause.

WHAT IS WAR?

War is a profound disturbance and derangement of the social and moral order.

The fact that there are still learned people who think war necessary and almost beneficial, and that we are met here to find arguments condemning it, is the most evident proof of the perversion it has brought into the feelings, thoughts and doings of men.

Who was ever bound to prove that hemlock seed can produce nothing but hemlock? that a son of brigands, brought up and living among brigands, can but grow to be a brigand himself?

Not so of war!

Mankind can prosper only by labor, wealth, justice, liberty. War stops labor, swallows up wealth, tramples upon justice and liberty.

It has been, alas! imposed sometimes in vindication of that which was sacred.

A nation tired of long oppression rises as one man and by dint of sacrifices and heroism secures her liberty by force of arms. But, before the spectacle of so many victims in the two hostile camps, of so many conflagrations, ruins and devastations; thinking of the brutal instincts awakened, strengthened and even honored during the war, and of the bitterness it entails at its termination upon both the conquered and the conquerors, an honest man must feel that war, even when inevitable, is always sad and miserable.

And yet, it is surrounded in history by a dazzling halo of poetry and of glory; the most renowned poems in all ancient and modern literatures are hymns to war; the most stately monuments glorify warriors, and even now-a-days, because we want to suppress, in the so-called civilized world, this relic of barbarous ages, we are pointed to by a certain class of conceited literati and politicians as half-witted people or visionaries. The apologists of war repeating, like parrots, the so oft confuted sentences of Hobbes, De Maistre and Hegel, maintain that war is not only fatally inherent in human nature, but also beneficial, being an instrument of civilization, fitted alone to revive in men the virtues of heroic sacrifice and self-denial. These apologists for war are, unconsciously to themselves, the strongest argument against it, proving, as they do, that from the intellectual and moral perversion emanating from war even those are not safe, who, because of their talent and studies, should be the most averse to such a curse.

The position of these theorists is well known. It consists in considering events that have happened hitherto as if they were necessarily to be repeated forever, and in drawing from them immutable laws.

War has existed in the past. It is still possible and breaks out now and then in the civilized world and among savage tribes. Therefore war shall exist forever.

The answer has been made a thousand times to these superficial philosophers that mankind is continually being transformed, and the present world is so different from what it was, we do not say three or four thousand years ago, but two or three centuries ago, that, should a contemporary of the first American settlers come back to the world, he would recognize it no more.

There was chaos formerly; if any of these philosophers, the advocates of war, by a miracle of nature, had lived at that time, he would certainly have declared that chaos would be eternal.

When the troglodytes of the quaternary age were compelled to live in caves, the same philosopher would have said that man's life would be such forever.

Subsequently, in the middle ages, when men fought one another within the walls of their own city or between villages of their own native country, the philosopher of the perpetuity of war would have pronounced him a mad man who should have foretold that men one day would travel safely and unarmed from one part of the globe to another.

THE STATE OF WAR IN EUROPE.

As the mediæval wars between man and man have ceased to the advantage and glory of civilization, so likewise war between different nations shall come to an end.

Happy are you, citizens of the United States of America, who in these war-advocating theories can see but a weakness of the human mind. Unfortunately for us Europeans they serve to maintain and support a state of things, both political and social, which is utterly prejudicial to the liberty and prosperity of peoples.

The state of war which exists in Europe, even when actual war is absent, finds in those theorists its most specious defence.

But the true reasons for preserving this state of war are those which are not spoken.

Wherever war was a normal state, it created castes and families interested in perpetuating it.

The first kings were fortunate captains, and, faithful to tradition, monarchs have an irresistible passion for war. We see every now and then the proof of it when monarchs visit one another. The most beautiful spectacle which the visited sovereign thinks he can offer to his august visitor is that of great reviews of soldiers and fleets. Deprive kings and emperors of their great armies, and they would think themselves half dethroned. Were it not more beautiful, more worthy of civilized people, to show to one's guest the progress achieved in science, industry, fine arts and above all in matters of social justice?

Very seldom has military power been accompanied by economical prosperity, and never by liberty.

WAR IN THE PAST.

Tiberius Gracchus in the days of Rome's greatest power is compelled to cry out: "Even wild beasts have their lairs; the combatants for Rome's defence and glory have no asylum. The patricians (the kings of that time) do lie, when they call the plebeians to fight *pro aris et focis* (for their altars and their fires). The *salus populi suprema lex* (the safety of the people is the supreme law) was always for the Senate and the patricians a mere pretence in order to lord it over and enrich themselves at the expense of the vanquished."

Under Charles V., Spain reached the highest degree of military power and at the same time of poverty and destitution. Bread had become so precious that it was called God's countenance; the ostentatious and proud nobles themselves many a time went to bed supperless.

Under Charles Emanuel of Savoy and Victor Amadeus II., Piedmont reached a high degree of power, but misery reached a still higher degree, so that in certain places the peasants were forced, in order not to die of starvation, to go about looking in the dung of horses, for the undigested grains of corn, and fed upon them.

Napoleon I. signalizes his victories by the creation of kingdoms and majorates which he bestows upon his most faithful lieutenants; but to the French people he gives, to reward their devotion, the famine of the continental blockade and the suppression of all their liberties.

Of the five billion francs which victorious Germany compelled France to pay in 1871, a portion served to form conspicuous endowments in behalf of the generals who had commanded her armies, but the poor private soldiers received nothing of the rich booty, and now the German people, as the price of the blood shed by them, are poorer than before.

ECONOMICAL EFFECTS.

Europe, you know, in order to enjoy the blessings of armed peace, annually spends four billions and a half, keeping three million and a half of soldiers in arms.

If this money was left to agriculture and industry, it would give bread and employment to seven or eight millions of husbandmen and laborers, whose labor would produce at least five or six billions more. This would be the source of new employment and profit, which would somewhat check that invasion of poor emigrants, the damages of which you citizens of the United States well know are beginning to equal if not already to exceed its advantages.

In a few years you have almost paid up all the debt which the war of secession laid upon you ; in Europe, on the contrary, the national debt of different States, owing to the enormous military expenses, is always increasing. The profound saying of Bastiat is thus confirmed : " War is a monster that devours not only by its meals but also by its digestions."

The increase of taxation on one hand and the absorption of capital on the other are productive of those periodic economical crises which have in late years been growing so grievous and frequent in Europe, and in some countries have even become chronic.

CONTRADICTIONS.

The Gospel says, " If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? "

Well, what seemed to the merciful Jesus a monstrous, absurd and impossible thing is now taking place in many countries of Europe, and, to begin with, in my own.

The workman asks for employment and bread, and the government answers him by the conquest of the sands and stones of Abyssinia ; the trader and agriculturist ask for alleviation of taxes and assurance for the morrow, and the government answers by making bullets, guns and ironclads, which cause every two or three years an increase of imposts ; the merchant and manufacturer ask for free trade in order to sell their products far and wide ; the government answers by the war of tariffs.

This state of things, full of enormous contradictions and dangers, would not last, if, as I said in beginning, there were not castes and families having an interest to preserve it.

The present order is a great economical and moral disorder ; the so called European equilibrium is a great unbalanced structure held together by bayonets.

In England and in this glorious country of the United States the laboring classes have many times been striking by hundreds of thousands without the police or government thinking of sending among them soldiers who should intimidate them. Do not imagine that the same holds good in the countries of Europe blessed with the luxury of great standing armies.

No sooner is a strike of peasants or sulphur miners in Sicily announced than companies of battalions of infantry are sent to the spot, and sometimes even cavalry, who at once put themselves at the disposal of the Syndic, who is almost always a great landowner. A few months ago at Caltavoturo in Sicily the soldiers were seen to fire at the unarmed population, who had risen, men and women, to protest against the appropriation which the landowners of the place, almost all municipal Councillors, had made

in their own behalf, of the landed property belonging to the community, that is, to the poor.

It is obviously natural that this should happen. A state of war in the midst of civilization, such as the present state of many parts of Europe, seems nonsensical, but to make it possible for such nonsense to exist, the whole social order must bow before it.

Chivalrous feeling and military honor are boasted to be the product of war. The history of war is full of facts showing the contrary. A few examples will suffice.

In 1681 Strasburg, a free city, on the faith of the treaty of Nimeguen, signed by the French government, lets the Austrian garrison depart, and dismisses its own particular garrison; on the 18th of October, without any declaration of war, a French detachment seizes by surprise upon the principal fort; in the evening thirty-five thousand soldiers surrounded the city; the following day Strasburg belonged to France.

Frederick II. attacks Sweden treacherously, while his ambassadors, in token of peace, were on their way to Vienna, and to exculpate himself, says: "Is it my fault, if my soldiers marched more quickly than the ambassadors?"

William I., in his famous manifesto of 1870, like its predecessor in 1809, says he makes war on the government, not on the people of France. But, after the victory, when Napoleon III. was already a prisoner, it is from France that he wrests Alsace and Lorraine and extorts the five billions.

In 1871, three French generals signed a promise of safe-conduct to some Arabians, upon the condition that the latter should lay down their arms. The Arabs, after this capitulation in perfect order, were demanded back by the civil jurisdiction, under pretext that the generals had gone beyond their powers, and part were shot, part confined in a penal bagnio.

Immoral in its conduct, disastrous in its effects, even when only latent, as in the state of armed peace, war is also immoral in its preparations.

When the aim of politics is war, and it is wished to carry this war against a nation, from which wrongs are supposed to have been received, all means are considered good in order to arouse the worst passions against that nation. In order to make her odious the least incidents are magnified; all the falsehoods and exaggerations to be found in the least reputed journals of that country are reported and commented upon with shameful malignity; there is nothing, however unlikely and absurd, which is not made to pass as deliberate intention or action on the part of the guilty nation.

THE MORAL SIDE.

No great effort of imagination is needed to form an estimate of the effects that facts, inventions and suggestions like those above recorded must produce upon the character of the populations.

The most effectual example of education comes from those in high places.

When the highest power is entrusted to men like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, who make the greatness and glory of their nation consist in respect for the principles of justice, liberty and morality, not only the public administration, but the private customs themselves are following a simple and regular course, which commands the admiration of other nations.

But where, whoever may be the men in power, force and cunning are supreme, where the State, under pretext of national defence, exercises an almost undisputed dictatorship; where it speaks in one way and acts in another; where, for its particular ends, it concurs in maintaining among the social classes ill-fated antagonisms; where success absolves from any public crime, how is it to be hoped that the common people should be public-spirited, that strong and upright characters should abound, that respect for the law should prevail in the conduct of parliament, parties and men.

THE REMEDY.

All have a confused feeling that war, when not for necessary defence, is immoral, absurd, contrary to civilization; but few are convinced that it is an evil that can be avoided.

In order to overcome the prejudice that war is a fatal necessity, it is not sufficient to convince the mind; one must do more, viz., educate the heart, and infuse into it feelings contrary to those which war has engendered there, viz., the love of our fellowmen, the feeling of human solidarity; one must above all create, or revive in those who already have a glimmer of it, the idea of a collective humanity.

Many a time, before the almost unsurmountable obstacles offered by the dreadful atmosphere of our present surroundings to the successful propagation of these ideas and feelings; seeing how easy it is for certain governments, by a simple word, to inflame the passions of a whole population and lead it astray, not a few of us would be tempted, like Thræseas Peto, to turn aside from the scene of conflict, or to flee away and escape the storm which is gathering and may perhaps overtake us. But we resist and remain standing at our places, and go on struggling; wearing away our minds and bodies, some of us, perhaps, shortening our lives, to defend the cause of civilization and peace, the cause of humanity and brotherhood.

Nor are we alone, we of the European Peace Societies, in main-

taining this warfare against the overbearing insolence of militarism and the hereditary prejudices of war.

Men of noble intellects and hearts are to be found in all liberal parties and in all classes who are striving to make, in international relations, the power of right overcome that of might.

At the van of all parties, on their way to the peace and union of all peoples, we see the Socialists of Germany.

The struggle which they have been maintaining for so many years, especially since 1870, against the old politics, which makes the power of a State consist in its territorial extent, is the most admirable that has ever been witnessed in our century. Men of science and of great talents, who could have reaped honors and riches in other fields, have borne exile, prison and destitution to keep their faith in their ideals of moral regeneration.

It is not for me, nor is it the place here, to say how much of truth there may be in the ideas cherished by German Socialists. But we are bound, for the sake of truth, conscientiously to affirm here, that what they demand concerning international relations, disarmament, arbitration and a citizen soldiery, is exactly what many Peace Societies, the Lombard Union among others, have from the beginning inscribed in their program. Let it be said, because it is the truth, that if but a portion of the stubborn energy the German Socialists exhibit in the defence of their principles had always been displayed by the Peace Societies in their propaganda, the progress of the ideals of arbitration and international confederacy would have been by far greater in the public opinion of Europe.

And now, as the conclusion of my paper, I venture to present the following propositions to the Congress :

1. Whereas, in the moral order, whoever has made most progress, individual or national, ought to help others to advance as far as he himself has gone ; and whereas in the political order the state of war will cease when a nucleus, with a federal compact, shall have been formed among the now divided nations :

The Congress proclaims that the gratitude of civilized humanity will be well merited by those nations which shall make themselves centres of the movement whose harbingers are the various congresses and conferences of an international character, whose aim is peaceful confederation.

2. The fifth Congress, deploring the fact that in some countries, in the government schools and systems of instruction, the worship of warlike traditions is still preserved, a worship so contrary to the principles of morality and the interests of civilization ; and seeing the stubborn struggle which the Socialists of Germany have been and are maintaining for obtaining a noble peace by means of international disarmament and arbitration ;

While sending them sincere congratulations for their conduct,

earnestly wishes that all the friends of peace, in whatever field they may be found, should work with as much energy, using all the means granted them by their local conditions, to fight against warlike passions and national hatreds, and diffusing sentiments of love and solidarity among all the nations of the world, beginning with the nearest.

SR. VICTOR ZEGGIO was then called upon and spoke as follows :

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — Hardly a more beautiful, noble and humanitarian subject could be found to be discussed by a speaker.

Universal peace has been from the most remote times up to the present days the dream of all noble souls, philosophers and poets.

War should not now exist, or else it should be left only to barbarian tribes, while peace should mark the highest point of modern civilization and progress.

While we are as yet quite far from this point, yet we are steadily approaching it.

International Arbitration is the only means by which we can accomplish our aim, and all fervent advocates, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from one end of the world to the other, should unite for this one purpose.

But not alone do European and American States resort to Arbitration ; for in 1876 Persia and Afghanistan referred their differences to Arbitration, and again in 1879 China and Japan did the same.

These two nations referred their cases in regard to the possession of the Loo Choo Islands to General Grant, and this last mentioned case has been without doubt a triumph of our ideas. But, alas ! such a humanitarian institution has not, as yet, succeeded in preventing conflicts for political supremacy and national independence, and as a consequence of all this the European populations are the sufferers.

Universal alliances will never amount to anything, as long as the people are not allowed their natural limits, and as long as barriers of all kinds are separating them.

The mosaic, to use a modern expression, of the European map, is the worst enemy of peace. The day when the people of Europe shall be ethnographically divided, when they shall be freed from all foreign domination, then only can peace be assured and the United States of Europe a realizable dream, then only will the Tribunal of International Arbitration become a permanent institution.

Italy follows with energy and love the movement tending to disarmament and peace. One of the most widely popular newspapers of Italy, *Il Secolo*, of Milan (and it may even be called the

official organ of the League of Peace), and its Director, Mr. Teodoro Moneta, are among the most fervent advocates of peace.

The "*Unione Lombarda della Pace*," the least Platonic of all our institutions having for their object this noble ideal, has honored me in naming me as its delegate, together with Dr. Hector Patrizi, a worthy and energetic advocate, and its Representative in Chicago, and Professor Oldrini, a zealous promoter of Social Reforms.

Little can I say and certainly nothing new; but as I have the conviction that all great ideas, in order to accomplish their aims, must be constantly repeated, so, in a few words, I will give my opinions on this subject.

International Arbitration is, for the moment, the only possible means to avoid deadly conflicts.

It has already given a splendid showing lately in preventing conflicts, not only among civilized nations, but in some cases also among people called barbarous.

The first arbitration took place in 1794, between England and the United States, and it was decided by three members named by each of the two nations. Five other controversies have taken place between the above mentioned nations since 1871, and every one has been decided by means of Arbitration. Worthy of mention is the case of 1871, in which presided the Italian, Frederic Sclopis. A similar decision was rendered by the Hon. Mr. Marsh, United States Minister at Rome in 1874, on account of differences having arisen between Italy and Switzerland in regard to territorial limits.

I will call your attention, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the verdict given by the Italian, Baron Blanc, in regard to the question which arose in 1885 between your country and Spain, and also to the part which Italy is taking in the actual Behring Sea case.

The frequency of the choice of Italian delegates to International Tribunals of Arbitration is an indisputable fact, and this plainly shows how, among sister nations, Italy enjoys the reputation of being a nation eminently civilized and of peaceable endeavor.

This League of Peace binds together parties of widely different inclinations. Teodoro Moneta is a convinced Republican.

Ruggero Bonghi, another of the most fervent and devoted advocates of peace, is a Monarchist in the most strict sense of the word. This will evidently demonstrate how all good-hearted men, no matter to which political party they may belong, are united, at least, for the quiet solution of this humanitarian problem.

My wishes are, that for the benefit of civilization and progress the voice of this International Congress may be heard and obeyed by all European Governments, that all its adherents of every nationality and land may do all in their power to help the diffu-

sion of this noblest of all ideas, and that the solution of these questions, which are a constant menace to Peace, be speedily reached, viz., the "Irredentism of Italy," the *Oriental question* and the *equilibrium of the Mediterranean Sea*.

If, from this country, so happily free from militarism, should come the powerful word, powerful enough to be heard and considered, this country of George Washington could then proudly add another star to its Republican Crown.

Mr. Zeggio remarked that Mr. Moneta had sent a flag, which had arrived, but for some reason could not be reached being in the Custom House. He said that the standard would be presented some other day as a sign of fraternity from Italy toward the United States, and of peace that should hold together all countries from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from one end of the world to the other. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I have now great pleasure in asking Dr. Adolf Richter, who represents Germany, to read a paper on "The Burdens Inflicted upon the People by War." At the close of this paper the question will be thrown open for discussion and we shall be glad to have short addresses from as many as will have the goodness to send up their names.

THE BURDENS IMPOSED BY WAR ON THE PEOPLE.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — At the seventh session of the Peace Congress at Berne, on the 26th of August, 1892, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood and Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, eminent workers in the American Peace Movement and faithful supporters of our common cause, made the proposition and expressed the expectation that the fifth Congress should be held at Chicago on the occasion of the Columbian Exposition. After a little hesitation and a short discussion, on motion of our distinguished French friend, Frederic Passy, who in spite of his years still fights with youthful ardor in the front ranks of the battle, this proposition was unanimously accepted. And in my judgment rightly so, for not only does our peace cause have an exceptionally large number of adherents in the United States of America, not only is your government giving a most instructive example and seeking by friendly offers to turn the other nations also into the path of friendly solution of International differences, but I am also of the opinion that our American friends, through their participation, in considerable numbers, in the Congresses of Europe, at Paris, London, Rome and Berne, have won the right to expect a visit from us to their country.

So, then, we Germans have appeared here, to give evidence that the German people wish peace; that they wish to take part in the

great work of civilization, which shall serve to bring into practice between nations also, in place of violence, the same principles of justice which cultivated men have long since recognized in their dealings one with another. We have also come all the more gladly, in order to learn to know the country which for many years has given a protecting shelter to so many of our fellow countrymen, and likewise also this city where, so to speak, every other man is a German.

I have come hither after a hard, even bitter contest in my native land,— a contest of the free citizens against the militarism which with us is more and more all-devouring. Though our friends have this time also been beaten by a majority of eleven votes, and thereby new and crushing burdens have been laid upon the people, yet this struggle has shown, on the one side, that the majority of the people stood on our side, and, on the other, that the peace movement is gaining a firm foothold in Germany and that the number of its pronounced adherents is increasing. Only the most unheard of scarecrows and representations of threatening danger, which clothe themselves in official dress, succeeded with difficulty in winning this very small majority for militarism.

Are not the burdens which rest on the peoples of Europe through the constant strife for the greatest number of troops, already in fact enormous, and especially in Germany, my native country, which, from time out of mind, in the middle ages and down to the present moment has been the battleground of foreign armies and yet to-day feels the after-effects of the disturbances and exhaustion of those long wars? Was it not conceded in the Reichstag by Herr Von Bennigsen, who is certainly friendly to the Government, that on account of the all-devouring militarism no money is at hand for the most necessary equipments? If we consider the monstrous sums which the States of the Continent spend every year on their armies and navies, of course (as they say) only for the maintenance of peace, and the growth of these in the last twenty years, we shall clearly see that, on the one side, these burdens can not thus be much longer borne, that the people, exhausted in time of peace, are breaking down under the weight of their armor, and consequently the purpose can not at all be attained which the governments have in view, viz., to render their people capable of resistance in time of war. On the other hand, every sensible man will think that the Austrian Minister Kalnok is certainly right, who recently declared at a meeting that he sees the danger of war precisely in the greatness of the armaments, because there is a natural tendency to wish to test the increased strength; the tightly drawn bow needs only a little thrust to send the arrow whizzing away. I have taken the following authentic figures, in French money, of the present military burdens from the work of Captain I. Molard, professor in the military school. From these the increase during the last twenty years, pointed out above, will stand out with frightful significance:

	1869.	1892.
France,	fr. 588,852,970	fr. 864,150,757
Russia,	615,660,744	1,239,717,460
Germany,	280,417,743	702,121,056
England,	605,675,000	529,750,008
Austro-Hungary,	227,580,869	393,062,460
Italy,	176,751,008	362,104,431
Belgium,	36,885,000	51,155,862
Bulgaria,		20,617,435
Denmark,	18,166,774	36,682,294
Spain,	125,456,696	178,309,128
Greece,	3,591,260	23,821,763
Holland,	51,649,365	74,982,814
Montenegro,		
Portugal,	27,969,468	44,488,862
Roumania,	18,047,822	38,355,598
Servia,	16,211,276	11,327,483
Sweden,	} 22,735,008	43,541,240
Norway,		14,329,740
Switzerland,	2,587,258	45,253,591
Turkey,	100,076,375	?
Total,	2,905,670,376	4,973,701,482

Surely one might despair in the presence of such numbers, if one were not encouraged by the fact that the number of the friends of peace in Europe is also seen to be continually growing. In consequence of our appeal sent out from the Berne Congress, there has also at last been formed in Berlin a large German peace society, to which the already existing associations have attached themselves as auxiliaries. This society has done me the honor to send me here as one of its representatives.

With the growth of the burdens, grows more ardent also the wish of the peoples that tribunals may be established through which conflicts of arms may be banished from the world. In fact scarcely a year passes by in which there is not an actual decision by such a tribunal, showing how easily this way may be entered upon where the wish to do so exists, and that it also reaches the desired goal. In the way of treaties for the establishment of arbitral union between nations is progress also being made, not only here in your land, but we hope also that your invitation and appeal to the European States has not fallen upon unfruitful soil. Indeed, in military Germany the friends of peace succeeded in the Reichstag in securing the insertion in the new commercial treaties concluded a few years ago of a clause providing that all difficulties arising in connection with them should be settled by arbitration.

When we see what awful burdens the armed peace has already laid upon the peoples, — burdens which, through private sacrifices of individuals for their own sons in arms or for the maintenance of the armies in time of peace, represent a considerably greater sum than that given above, — yet how immensely greater are the burdens and terrors which actual war brings with it, especially a future war in which such masses of men, furnished with the most

perfect instruments of destruction, will fall upon one another. He who has once experienced the horrors of a war, who has seen with his own eyes the sorrow and misery following in its train (and there are many such among us), must agree with the statement, "War is an awful misfortune even for the victor." Certainly we in Germany can bear witness to this; we have felt it in our own persons; and still to-day the ruins of our old cities and villages proclaim the destructiveness of war; still to-day our chronicles tell of the fierceness and cruelty of soldiers whom war had brutalized, of plague and famine which nearly always following in the wake of armies have desolated our territories. Even if war, thanks to international agreements, is now more humane, if it is no longer waged against the private citizens of hostile countries, from whom in former times fierce marauders took away their last possession, yet it has retained otherwise all of its horrors and burdens, and the mere thought that thousands of brave, noble men in their best years shall be compelled to kill others and to be killed themselves, while the products of their industry, secured by years of painstaking labor are lost perhaps for ever, must fill every true friend of humanity with shame and horror. In a truly noble way and with the deepest feeling has our noble friend, the Baroness Von Suttner, painted the horrors of war in "*Die Waffen Nieder*," a story which has been translated into nearly all modern languages. It fell like a kindling spark into ready material, and it has won for us a host of zealous coworkers.

Up to the present time, unfortunately, things are in such a state that in case of a war the entire strength of the nations participating will be brought into requisition; and in order that they may give their last man and their last penny it is necessary that before the war they should be brought into the right disposition and be kept thus while it is going on; for it is my deepest conviction that modern peoples do not wish war. Those who wish to wage war, or rather to keep up the possibility of war, are, in comparison with the millions of people at large, small in numbers, but — they are those in power. Here the peace associations must apply their lever, they must seek to bring to the consciousness of the masses the thought that wars are not something unavoidable, an institution established by God; that on the contrary through international arbitration even international strifes can be done away; that it is an unjustifiable pre-judgment to think that a people sacrifices something of its dignity when it submits its case to a third party; in other words, that the principles which are the pillars of States and of modern human society must also come to prevail in politics and in the intercourse of peoples one with another.

At any rate mountains of prejudices will yet be cleared away, and when the principle of arbitration shall have become a living reality among nations, then the realization of this noblest of all thoughts will not be far distant. We must, the very first thing,

win the newspapers, which in Europe, by their senseless chauvinism and their incitements to war, have done so much mischief on both sides of the Rhine, especially as they are usually considered the outcome of public opinion. We must also win our parliaments, which will always have a certain deciding influence, even where questions of war and peace are not left to them to decide.

More and more must the thought be pushed that only to the true friends of peace can the destiny of peoples be entrusted, and that only such should be chosen as representatives. In both these ways, moreover, very encouraging progress is to be noted; and in fact upon me and upon all who were present did it make a very strong impression when at the Capitol in Rome in 1891 the representatives of seventeen European nations gave expression to their desire for peace. I consider such a demonstration much weightier than the after-dinner speeches which are made at one of the customary meetings of princes, in order to conceal their thoughts, notwithstanding our so-called politicians lend an anxious ear to them. Alongside of the parliamentary agitation is found the activity of our Congresses, constituting a popular agitation; and over against the activity of the Representatives stands that of the electors. We must seek to make it clear to our fellow citizens that we have got beyond the times of the ancient heroism; that it is not a beautiful or noble thing when cannon vomit forth death and destruction and scatter bits of flesh and fragments of bone around, in order to show who is in the right. Is such a thing worthy of the present state of humanity? We say no, and again no. The fact that thousands have come together here out of all lands to show their participation in the work of peace, is a proof that our ideas are spreading farther and farther. The work must be carried forward through earnest and faithful effort until no longer shall public discussion be controlled by the next war, but the next decision of international arbitration shall have possession of all minds. Those are mighty who control the destiny of peoples and to-day have the reins of government in their hands, but public opinion is mightier still; and when once it has declared itself, no ruler has ever been able to resist it. Let us draw new courage from such a meeting as has to-day brought together the friends of peace on the occasion of the celebration of a notable event in civilization. Let us go back to Europe filled with the thought that on the other side of the ocean also many combatants are contending for the same idea, and with the hope that we too shall succeed, after the example of our American brethren, in reaching the goal for which we are all striving, "the (in peace) United States of Europe."

THE CHAIRMAN: The question, the economic aspects of war, is now before the Congress for free discussion, but I am anxious to deal impartially with all who desire to speak, and if I am to do that I must limit the speakers to five minutes.

I shall therefore take this bell, which I suppose is put here for the purpose, and at the end of five minutes will give notice to the speaker that his time has come to an end. I will ask Mr. Alfred Cridge, of San Francisco, to speak first.

MR. CRIDGE: Ladies and Gentlemen — I am not certain that the line of remarks which I may make will strictly fall within the limits of the economic aspect of the subject. But I will take the risk of remarking what I was going to say. The particular point to which I want to draw attention is that the war spirit derives its nutriment from our electoral system of representation by districts. In a district there are two or three candidates, and their friends are in opposition to each other. The voters on each side use their most strenuous influence not simply to elect their man but also, as a necessary means to that end, to deprive their opponents of any representation at all. That is our system of competitive, war-like politics. I advocate replacing it by co-operative peace politics (applause), so that one thousand electors can elect their man without depriving another thousand of theirs. That is co-operation; that is peace, which means plenty. But under our present system, worked as it must be by a party machine, the men who get into power as legislators represent less than one-half the population commonly, and the acts, therefore, of the majority of that body represent only one-quarter or less of the voters. Incapable and unscrupulous persons get to be legislators, and hence we have war. Our civil war of 1861-5 was a necessary consequence of our political system. The people do not make war, national or civil. It is the politicians and rulers that make these wars. (Applause.) I think the Italian gentleman here was right when he made a remark to that effect. With true representation there would be no war, and that is the way in which we can aid perpetual peace and plenty.

One of the Italian gentlemen remarked, I think, that strikes in Italy and in the United States were carried on very differently; that when a strike occurred in Italy the whole military force required was at once placed at the disposal of the syndic, who is described as probably a large real estate owner. He understood that nothing of the kind took place in the United States. I am very much under the impression that something of that kind does take place. Look at our mines in Idaho in which the militia directly interfered on the part of the proprietors of the respective establishments; and I would say more, that those incidents at Homestead are but the coming specks of a coming war if we persist in our present methods, and if all the newspapers persist in claiming that the people rule and that the people make the laws, when the people do not rule, when there is no representative government on this planet outside of the cantons of Switzerland.

THE CHAIRMAN: In exercising the prerogative of the

chairman just now, in fixing the limit of speeches, I tried, as fairly as I could, to divide the remainder of the time left to us for our session between those who had sent up their names, but I have had several names sent up since, and therefore we must depend upon the generosity of those who have the right to speak first to make their remarks as short as possible. We will now hear from Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood.

MRS. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD: Mr. Chairman — I would defer to some others who have sent up their names and speak some other time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Kirkland, of Chicago.

MRS. KIRKLAND: I will only say that there is no necessity for me to take a minute of time, because somebody stole my thoughts. That is to say, our friend from Germany spoke of that most delightful and invaluable book, "Die Waffen Nieder," and I thought somebody in this room might not have heard of it, and I would like everybody in this room to do what is possible to spread that admirable book, which, if it be not a life's experience, certainly reads exactly like it. It shows us that the terrors of war, which we imagined to have disappeared with mediæval times, have not ceased; that indirectly pestilence and famine come from war, though people are more quiet about them and they do not come as much from intentional action of the ruling powers. If you want to know how the people are urged on and worked up to think that every war is a holy war, you have only to read that book. I wish it could be distributed to millions throughout the civilized world.

THE SECRETARY: There are two translations of this book in this country. One was made here in Chicago, and was published by McClurg & Company. This translation includes only a little over half of the work. There is an authorized English edition, published by Longmans, Green & Company of London and New York, translated by Mr. T. Homes under the supervision of the author herself. The title of the Chicago book is "Ground Arms," and the authorized translation is entitled "Lay Down Your Arms."

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Amanda Deyo will next address the Congress.

MRS. AMANDA DEYO: Kind friends of the Convention — I would be very glad to give my time to any one else who has handed in a name as I expect to have my opportunity to-morrow morning, but as five minute speeches are wanted I shall endeavor to bring my remarks within that limit. First, I would like to give some thought upon the able — upon all the able papers which have been given here this morning.

It is to me a glorious thing that we have gathered together to try to make conditions under which settlements of all difficulties can be upon a different basis from that of force. So the question comes to us, "Can it be that you men can stop killing each other?" (Applause.) Can it come? Now I, as a mother, believe that the great principles of truth, of life, of love are mightier than Krupp guns, mightier than all the cannons that can ever be manufactured, and therefore in my heart of hearts I believe that it is possible for the human race to advance upon these lines of life and truth and love. Life, the gift of God to us, and in each human heart that divine, glorious element that we honor as truth, and as love, — these principles are mighty and they shall be for the pulling down of all these strongholds. Now this truth has been uttered in many ways. You know that in the time of the Civil War between the North and South, we had paper money, and they said, "When shall we resume specie payment?" Why, the time just came and we said, "Resume," and that is all. Some say, "O it is such weakness not to be backed up by martial forces." Well friends, we women stand in that position in all the nations of the world. You good brothers of the United States of America said that taxation without representation was tyranny, and you got up and fought your old mother for seven long years, and you turned around and did the same thing with your wives and mothers and daughters and sisters ever since. (Applause.)

We have got one spot — one brother said four cantons in Switzerland — we have got Wyoming where woman stands equal with man.

Who ever thought Uncle Tom, the old black man who lay bleeding and dying in that old cabin in the South, would have a monument? But the story touched the heart of Harriet Beecher Stowe, and with all the brilliancy of her pen and the love of her mother heart flowing out, she gave Uncle Tom a monument in this country, and it wrought mightily to the pulling down of that old tyranny of the country. I believe that with the aid of this book of the Baroness Von Suttner, as she takes up this cause which it is the privilege of the mother heart to advocate, we shall be heard and save our husbands and fathers and brothers from this bloody tyranny of war. And so, I say, stop all war, and let us have peace. Let us commence from this time onward, and let us, the mothers that sit here to-day, have as much love for our husbands and sons and brothers as we have for our linen and china. Just imagine how the women of the world would besiege all the governments of the world if our linen and china closets were desecrated. (Applause.) But a much greater thing for women to care for is their boy as he goes out into the world. We want the ballot and the influence which it gives in order that we may take up the economic aspects of this question. The woman that has staid in the home and helped to pay the interest on the mortgage, who has made everything in the home, made much of the pur-

chasing power which the man uses, ought to have a right to speak. They say women are naturally mean and ungrateful, and so they say of men. I say it is not true — you are naturally divine, you came from a divine heritage, and that is God. Don't believe those old theories any longer. It is like the old theory, in time of peace prepare for war. The true theory is, in time of peace prepare for peace. I want every gentleman to feel, when he goes out of this hall, that he has a protector — that is a woman. (Applause.) The women will make war upon war with the weapons that are mighty, for the great forge in which we have our weapons cast is the forge of God Almighty Himself. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Rev. S. W. Boardman, of Tennessee.

PRESIDENT BOARDMAN: I would but call attention to what our presiding officer said in relation to Christ's part and place in this great movement. Of course this is a gathering of Christian nations and an exposition of Christian industries very largely. This Congress is especially Christian. Christ said, "Without me ye can do nothing." I call attention for a moment to the fact that this cause seems to be, in some especial sense, identified with the work of Christ as the Prince of Peace in prophecy: "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, their spears into pruning hooks."

I would direct attention especially to that expression about the increase of His government. A great deal has been said here about free government and of the progress of government. "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." While this peace has reference, possibly, primarily to the effect of Christ's work upon the individual soul, bringing men to have peace with God, it also directly covers this matter of peace among men, of individuals in community, and especially international peace. "*Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*"

In the great Exposition we have all been impressed with the military display, with that great ship, the Illinois, and other exhibitions of the same kind — grand monuments of our industry and art, but it really struck me as something ridiculous, for what are those immense guns pointing out in every direction? The idea that mankind, in their higher efforts, should construct such a ship as that and man it with such guns, that some of these brothers may shoot and kill and destroy other brothers! I could but think that those things must be (for we are told of the prince of the power of the air, the God of this world) the very delight of hell itself. Those monster guns as works of art and industry are magnificent, but in moral relation what are they? In the magnificent gathering of the great men-of-war at Hampden Roads and New York, associated peacefully together, we have some indication of this increase of peace. I have been surprised — I think

every one here excepting those best informed has been surprised at the large hold which this subject has taken upon the nations of the earth. The Christian nations are really coming under the power of the Prince of Peace according to the promise and the song of the angel, "Peace on Earth," and I hold this Congress, not very large in numbers but composed of earnest hearts, to be one of the most hopeful signs, one of the most striking fulfilments of that ancient promise, the fulfilment of which is as sure as our existence, as sure as the existence of God. "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. J. J. Miller will speak next.

J. J. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—I had prepared a paper to bring before this Congress proposing plans for inducing the governments of the different nations to start something substantial, to start a department in governments which would look toward an International Court of Arbitration. I am not permitted to-day to present that paper from the fact that I have but few moments allowed me. I remember reading in history that about two centuries ago at Rome there was a convention of bishops called, a convention of two hundred bishops, to decide the important question whether women should be permitted to commit the alphabet. Out of these two hundred bishops one hundred and ninety-six voted no, because learning the alphabet unfits and disqualifies her for her duty towards her husband; and they further declared that the woman who committed the multiplication table was a fit subject for hell. Think of it, ladies and gentlemen—only two centuries ago! Well, my revolutionary predecessor, what did you mean when you said taxation without representation was tyranny? My lady friends, are you paying no taxes, are you not amenable to the laws of your country? I believe freedom is an absolute necessity for universal peace,—unrestricted freedom in trade, in social relations, freedom of white and black, rich and poor, male or female.

Governments institute and manage war departments, which are departments of destruction. Now I hold that unless we have peace departments we will never bring about international peace. We must have departments in the government that will act upon that subject. We recently added an Agricultural Department, why not add a Peace Department? (Applause.) We cannot hope for success, if we use only school-exhibition methods in our work.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now call upon Mr. J. Branson.

MR. BRANSON: We have already war and the implements of war existing in our country, and in the world, and what we want to do, it seems to me, is to devise some means by which all the disputes that may arise between nations may be settled without resorting to the gun, to the cannon and to the sword. We want a permanent Board of Arbitration formed, for after two nations have

quarrelled, and are about to enter into war they are in no condition then to form a Board of Arbitration. The offending party will not listen if the defending party wants to nominate, and the defending party will not listen if the offending party wants to nominate, so in either case they will not nominate. What we want is a permanent Board of Arbitration, composed of representatives of every nation. What would have been the position of Siam in the late dispute had there been a Board of Arbitration? (Applause.) Would France have taken the advantage of Siam as it has done? Siam says, "We will refer the matter to arbitration," but there was no Board of Arbitration formed. Therefore France takes advantage, and settled the dispute in her own way. Why? Because Siam is a weak little nation and she dares do as she likes with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The subject of arbitration will come before the Congress as a distinct question for discussion on Thursday, so that you will be able to ventilate your ideas on that particular point then.

I have one more name, although our time has been a little extended, — Mr. John F. Hanson.

MR. JOHN F. HANSON: There is one thought I want to drop to this Congress to-day, and speaking in the words of the poet I will say, "War is a game that if the people were wise kings could not play it." I am confident all reforms begin at the bottom and work up. I believe in order to effect the object we have in view we must influence the masses. Our sisters are suffering because they have not the suffrage. We will have to form the sentiment which will come up and give them the franchise which they are entitled to. When I speak of people I do not mean church members. I speak of a great many people outside — of the masses who are to-day watching to see what the church will do. The church of God is responsible for the existence of wars and the liquor power and a great many other evil things. (Applause.) The church of God has an influence in every nation, and they are simply asking what attitude is this church of God taking on this war question, and they do not know what to do. The church of God has the word of God, and the prophet says, "He that has my word let him speak my word faithfully." And when the church of God will come up and say that the war system is opposed to Christianity, that it has no right to exist and live in our civilization, having a controlling force by vote and public sentiment, she can wipe out the war system from the face of the earth. Such is my faith. When I was over in Denmark and Norway fourteen years ago I could hardly ever get the aristocracy to come to a meeting at all, but I could get hundreds of laborers who were eager listeners upon this question.

I want to impress upon this Congress that, though we cannot all make speeches, we can go home and work up a sentiment

among the common people that shall tell in years to come. (Applause.)

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Bonney has sent in a little poem written by one of the reporters of the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*. I think we ought to read it. The *Inter-Ocean* and the other papers of the city are treating our meetings grandly. I wish they would all write poems and send them up.

The poem was then read as follows:

PEACE VICTORIOUS.

BY THOMAS BAIRD.

[Dedicated to the Congress of Arbitration and Peace.]

Our pilgrim fathers years ago
Left hearth and home and crossed the flood;
Their fathers passed through seas of blood,
That liberty might reign below.

They came and claimed this Western sod,
The broad Atlantic held their fears;
The soil they wet with thankful tears
As there they gave themselves to God.

Columbia's greatness there began,
When conscience surely led the way
Into a purer, brighter day
Of freedom and of hope for man.

Still o'er the ages shines the light
That guided first her pilgrim sons;
Through all her laws the legend runs:
"This land of God and truth and right."

The nations, laden with their best,
In this triumphant year of grace,
Meet young Columbia face to face
In this great city of the West.

And all the years yield up their store,
And every clime and every land
Seems to fulfil the king's command
To live in peace and war no more.

From every clime and every land
Come voices of the future day,
When wrong and war shall pass away,
And love shall lead us by the hand.

How fitting then that strife should cease,
That creeds should sink, and all clasp hands,
As here we float above the sands
The banner of the Prince of Peace.

After which the Congress adjourned.

FOURTH SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16TH, 10 A. M.

The Congress was called to order at ten o'clock A. M. in the Hall of Columbus, Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey, of Winthrop Centre, Maine, presiding.

The session was opened with the singing of "America," and with prayer by the Rev. Mrs. Amanda Deyo, of Scranton, Pa.

After the singing of "Coronation," Mrs. Bailey, on taking the chair, spoke as follows :

WOMAN'S POWER TO MAINTAIN OR TO SUPPRESS
WAR.

Woman has been called the weaker vessel, but she surely possesses a power for good or for evil that is marvellous.

Our first mother had it within her power to make this world what she would and she introduced sin. Ever since her day this fair earth has been blighted by manifold evils, all of which woman can help to maintain or to suppress.

Nothing has contributed more towards making the history of this world than has warfare. It has given rise to some nations and has buried others in oblivion, and in all its deadly work it has felt the power of woman's influence.

It was the greatest aim of the Spartans to be a military people. Their girls were obliged to take part in gymnastic games that they might gain strength, which in future years they could bequeath to their soldier sons. The fine arts were abolished, Lycurgus believing that poetry and sculpture were too refining to be considered in the education of men whose one work was the killing of human beings.

The young boys received the strictest military training, being sent out in parties at night with instructions to kill whomsoever they might meet.

This was considered excellent practice for them. Moreover it hardened the hearts of the little fellows which was just the result desired. Domestic life and happiness were far below par. Marriage was encouraged for one object only, to raise sons for the field of conflict, and daughters who in turn might become mothers of soldiers. For this reason husbands never lived at their homes, for they did not wish to cultivate family affections.

For many ages military glory was considered the greatest

thing attainable on this earth. Some savage nations believe that the simple fact that a warrior dies in battle is a sufficient passport for him into the realms of the blest.

Civilized nations, while they do not preach such a doctrine, give the world to understand that they practically believe it.

With such an education it has been very easy for woman to respect the life of a soldier, and more because she is only permitted to see the glitter of military life, the revolting side being largely kept from her.

A large number of the wars of the world have been waged by avaricious kings. Some have destroyed kingdoms in order to gain a coveted prize.

Women, too, have sent out armies to wage wars in their individual interests, queens showing themselves as reckless as kings in "the trade of blood." Woman's personal charms have also caused war. Helen, the most beautiful woman of her time, was the direct cause of the long Trojan War, in which her former suitors swore to return her to her husband after she had fled with Paris to Troy. The fame of Cleopatra's beauty spread far and wide. Even the great Cæsar visited Egypt to behold her. Enamored with her at first sight, he took her part in her conflicts with her countrymen. Antony, another lover, proclaimed her at Alexandria "the queen of kings," but were we permitted to give a title to this wicked and ambitious queen we should call her the "queen of battle."

Woman has also made use of *revenge* as well as of *love* in inciting to war. One of the most revolting scenes of bloodshed on record is that on Saint Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1572, when twenty thousand persons were murdered as the direct result of the influence and planning of one woman, Catharine, the strong-minded mother of a weak-minded king.

Says William Ladd:—"Women are the mothers of men and they can give the tender mind an inclination to war or to peace.

"What they approve we follow; what they condemn we abandon."

Mind governs matter; and though woman be the weaker vessel as respects physical force, in mind she often shows herself to be the stronger. Many a man has not the moral courage to plead for peace for fear he shall be accused of effeminacy and cowardice.

To be the advocate of peace is congenial to woman's character. She who was last at the cross and earliest at the grave of the great Prince of Peace can still plead His cause. There is something peculiarly appropriate in woman's undertaking the cause of peace.

Men make war; let women make peace.

We would repeat those words:—"Let women make peace."

Men have been largely responsible for the warfare of the past. Woman may be largely responsible for the peace of the future. If wars exist, men are expected to carry them on. If permanent peace is to exist, woman will maintain it. But she must make no compromise on this great theme.

She must not say that some wars are right, that some cannot be avoided even by Christian people. Warfare is a sin according to the New Testament's teachings. She must teach this truth to her children.

If woman only fully realized how much warfare meant to her, she would surely be more eager to drive from this earth the baneful military system.

Many women do realize it, but, being disfranchised they can only raise their voices against this evil in their own homes.

Worn out with the care of her family and of her husband's work which she must carry on while he is engaged in active service, she can only patiently bear the heavy burdens of militarism.

O why do not more women whom God has endowed with special gifts devote them to the cause of peace? Why do they not stop for a moment and contemplate what war means to them? Woman is the queen of home, and home can never be safe while the demon of war is inventing instruments of destruction which are liable to utterly destroy it.

William Ladd further says to woman, "Use your first influence for the promotion of the cause of peace in your own family, on your husbands, brothers, sons. On all possible occasions point out the sin, the folly and the miseries of war.

"I request my fair country-women to examine the conduct of their past lives and their present feelings. If you fail in a known duty you are as answerable for the consequence of such neglect as though you had committed actual crime.

"If another war should sweep over our land, with all its demoralizing, soul-destroying consequences, can you clear the skirts of your garments from the blood of souls, unless you do something to prevent it?

"In moral revolutions women have equal power if not superior to men. It is in the power of the Church of Christ, of which women compose the greater part, to put a stop to war in Christendom, whenever it shall choose to exercise that power."

Are we exercising that power, my sisters? Are we doing all we can to make military life unpopular, to teach the children of to-day that a life of peace is the greatest boon Heaven can bestow on them?

How great is a woman's influence over her children! How often is "mother" the last word lisped by the dying soldier-boy. Ah, had mother only taught him that there is a better way of settling

difficulties than by bloodshed, her boy would not be thus sacrificing his young life.

The children are taught in the same Sabbath-school that they must not kill, and also that by imitating the life of the soldier, whose trade is to kill, they are glorifying God.

While contemplating such facts, we can but exclaim with Skakespeare :

“Consistency, thou art a jewel.”

The majority of our Sabbath-school teachers are women, and if the Boys' Brigade be driven from any schools where it has already gained a foothold, or be kept from being admitted into new schools, it will be largely through the influence of these women teachers.

I would like to add a word in regard to Sabbath-school concerts ; how often do the exercises on the program savor of military glory !

This would not be so if the teachers who do the preparatory work for these concerts were all peace women. Woman, in order to suppress war, must commence with the earliest education of the children.

Boys are too precious to be sacrificed by an enemy's bullets.

We hear a great deal about the women who sent their sons to the conflict with instructions to either return victorious or not return at all, but there are mothers who have shown far greater heroism by keeping their sons free from the crime of shedding blood.

And why should not a mother discourage her boy from entering warfare ?

Is he not more precious than all the kingdoms and governments of earth, for he will exist when they have all passed away.

The kingdom of peace *will sometime* be established on the earth. What the prophet has foretold *must surely* come to pass. Woman has now greater opportunities than ever before to raise her voice in the interests of peace. One hundred years ago she could not have done so. Woman now not only labors side by side with man in peace societies, but she has organized societies of her own for the purpose of suppressing war and encouraging peace.

The Peace department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is trying to prove to woman that she possesses great power to either maintain or to suppress war. Its literature and lectures have aroused her to the fact that if warfare exists to any great extent in the future, it will be because of her influence, for she has the first training of the future generations ; it is for her to say whether her sons shall be civilians or soldiers.

Women bind up the wounds of those whose bodies are torn by cannon and grapeshot; they nurse them in hospitals; they watch night and day by the bedside of those who are delirious with pain, and they smooth the pillows of the dying. Shall the office and ministry of women be limited to this? Are they to make no effort to prevent the evil they so tenderly seek to mitigate?

Must they always wait till the mischief is done, and then seek to repair it?

Is there no hope that, by standing on the threshold, they may resist this great evil, *War*, and forbid its entrance? This is a question, which, perhaps, the present age may solve; and let us hope that it will be solved in the interests of peace.

MRS. AMANDA DEYO was then introduced and spoke on "The Curse of War upon Woman." She said:

I must put into words the song I feel in my heart. Friends of peace from all lands, I bid you a cordial welcome, and "The New Song" of Whittier seems most fitting to the throbbings of my heart for the cause of peace and to the joy that inspires us all with hope of the future.

Sound over all waters, reach out from all lands,
The chorus of voices, the clasping of hands;
Sing hymns that were sung by the stars of the morn;
Sing songs that were sung when Jesus was born.

With glad jubilations
Bring hope to the nations,
The dark night is ending and dawn has begun;
Rise, hope of the ages, arise like the sun!
All speech flow to music, all hearts beat as one.

Sing the bridal of nations with chorals of love;
Sing out the war vulture and sing in the dove,
Till the heart of the people keep time in accord,
And the voice of the world is the voice of the Lord.

Clasp hands of the nations
In congratulations,
The dark night is ending and dawn has begun;
Rise, hope of the ages, arise like the sun;
All speech flow to music, all hearts beat as one.

Blow, bugles of battle, the marches of peace;
East, west, north and south, let the long quarrel cease,
Sing the song of great joy that the angels began;
Sing the glory to God and good will to man.

Hark! joining the chorus
The heavens bend o'er us;
The dark night is ending and dawn has begun;
Rise, hope of the ages, arise like the sun;
All speech flow to music, all hearts beat as one.

The topic assigned me is this: "The Curse of War upon Women." I do not know how better to voice the protest against war, than to repeat the manifesto of the French women against war as given by Madame Griess Traut.

We women belong to all lands ;

We, who form half the contingent of the nations ;

We, whom the laws of men have excluded from councils where once our mothers' voices caused Peace to triumph ;

We, on whom the barbarity and license of War ruthlessly inflict death and outrage ;

We, whom it deprives of all that our very being clings to — father, husband, son, home ;

We, whose consciences have not learnt to distinguish between the single homicide, justly branded and punished, and homicide in mass, though perpetrated on the innocent, which is rewarded with glory (?) ;

We have not forgotten the commandment : “ Thou shalt not kill ; ”

We, whom Society deems capable and fitted for its heaviest duties without the corresponding privileges ;

We, whose mission on earth is conciliation, peace, self-sacrifice ;

We, whom a longer silence would render accomplices in this detestable squandering of human life, this waste of treasure, this desolating of whole provinces !

WE PROTEST WITH ALL OUR ENERGIES

Against War — against this odious abuse of power,

Against the intentional disregard of the pacific means of INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, so prolific of good.

WE PROTEST

In the name of humanity — whose sacred laws are violated by War,

In the name of our country — deprived of her sons by War,

In the name of the family — dismembered and destroyed by War,

In the name of progress — driven back by War,

In the name of morals — perverted by War.

We, wives — we, mothers — we, caretakers of the family, request from all men, possessed of hearts, brotherly help in this Holy Crusade.

We address a burning appeal to all Legislators — to all Teachers of youth ;

Let them frame laws — let them second our efforts — let them teach to our children

A HORROR OF WAR — A HORROR OF CARNAGE — A HORROR OF FRATRICIDE.

The rest of Mrs. Deyo's address, given extemporaneously, the stenographer failed to get as he thought she was reading.

THE SECRETARY read, at the close of Mrs. Deyo's address, a letter written by Julia Ward Howe as follows :

MY DEAR SIR — It is with great regret that I find myself unable to attend the World's Fair Congress appointed to be held this month under the auspices of the Columbian Exposition.

Among the many questions whose open discussion adds to the interest of the present memorable celebration at Chicago, none is more worthy of attention than that which will occupy the time of your convention.

While the holding of international Expositions is in itself an evidence of the progress of pacific arts and ideas in all civilized communities, the practice of mankind in general remains far behind the convictions of those who desire that nations as well as individuals should govern themselves according to the Golden Rule.

We were grieved, twenty-one years ago, when France was despoiled of a part of her territory by a war in which she had indeed been the aggressor, but in whose final settlement her punishment far exceeded the limits of international justice. We are still more deeply grieved to-day at seeing that country, which has so recently suffered the horrors of war, herself engaged in inflicting those horrors upon a nation unable and unwilling to maintain a conflict with her.

To me, the great lesson of the Franco-Prussian War was the thought which it awakened in my mind that women, as the mothers of men, women, who pay at first hand the cost of human life, should have eminently the right to interfere for its protection. I endeavored then, with but small success, to arouse the women of Christendom to a sense of their responsibility, and to unite them in a protest against the arbitrament of the sword, and in favor of the settlement of international questions upon their real merits, appealing to the principles of common justice, and not to the brutal methods of armed violence.

I surely hope that the Congress about to be held will mark an epoch in the world's progress in the direction of a pacific guardianship of national rights and claims. And I further hope that in its counsels the voices of earnest women, eloquent in their own conviction, will not be wanting.

A temporary indisposition, added to the weight of my many years, keeps me from making the long journey to Chicago at this season. I shall wait eagerly for the good report of those who will meet with yourself to give the listening world "glad tidings of peace."

Yours in hearty fellowship,

JULIA WARD HOWE.

NEWPORT, R. I., Aug. 2, 1893.

THE BARONESS VON SUTTNER, of Vienna, sent the following letter, which was read by Madame Wisinger :

I send my cordial greetings to my fellow-workers now assembled in the cause of Peace. It is not only in my name, but in the name of the twenty-five members of our Committee, and, I may add, of thousands of members of our Austrian Peace Societies, that I write these lines, and that I assure you of the warm sympathy that is felt in this country with the great cause you have met to further.

We know full well that free and independent America is the soil on which grew and flourished the oldest Peace Societies. And gratefully we acknowledge that it was America that first passed from theory to practice. With you Arbitration soon became a tangible reality, and it was your Government that placed it on a firm basis at the memorable Congress of Washington in 1890, a basis on which, so we hope, and so we believe, the edifice of future Law and Order will eventually be reared.

The practical work of the European Peace Congresses and Inter-parliamentary Conferences is to-day mainly directed to further the adoption of the American proposals for the establishment of Tribunals of Arbitration between the two greatest English-speaking nations; the petitions emanating from the last Peace Congress in Berne, some of which, as in the case of England and Denmark, have already been presented by their promoters to their respective parliaments, all urge the acceptance of those fraternal overtures. We feel confident that if once a precedent of the kind were created, the example would soon be followed and the methods of arbitration would also be adopted to settle disputes between the States of Europe. And when the day dawns that brings the long-delayed victory to the friends of Peace, now subjected to the military rule, they will gratefully remember that the citizens of your free country were the first to recognize the practicability of Arbitration.

The members of the Austrian Peace Society will follow your debates with the keenest interest; they feel that nowhere could a Peace Congress more appropriately be held than within the precincts of the great World's Fair, in itself a symbol of friendly and peaceful contest between the most highly cultivated nations of the globe.

To my personal friends in America I send my cordial greetings, to Mrs. Belva Lockwood and Mr. Trueblood, to my brothers and sisters — I may call them so — for what link could be more fraternal than that which binds us together in common aims and aspirations! Their words spoken in the New World will re-echo in the Old World, infusing new life and energy into their fellow workers there, helping and supporting them in the task they have set themselves to accomplish.

To be counted amongst those workers will ever be the ardent desire of
Yours most sincerely,

VIENNA, Aug. 1, 1893.

BERTHA VON SUTTNER.

MRS. MARIE FISCHER-LETTE, who could not be present, sent the following letter :

LONDON, July, 1893.

For the first time in ten years I am unable to communicate verbally with my co-workers and have to take up my pen to forward my greetings and lay my ideas before them. I am sure the meeting of 1893 will prove more successful than any of former years. The ground is so well prepared. The Congresses which have preceded it have brought the ideas of peace and good will clearly before not only the members but also the public at large.

America has been able to realize her grand idea of calling the inhabitants of the globe to join in holding a World's Fair, because we live in peace. A beautiful, benign impulse prompted the youngest of the family of civilized nations to give a living example of what peace means and is. Progress in social and spiritual life can only be realized in time of peace.

The first of this series of Congresses was the Women's Congress. I had the honor of being a representative from an English Association on that occasion. Every State of America, every realm of Europe was represented, from Finland to Greece, from Lake Michigan to the Australian seas. In spite of this variety, the Congress was the very image of harmony. We listened to the speeches with equal attention, respecting each other's task and mode of work. Should this spirit govern everywhere, it would remarkably help on the peaceful intercourse of the world.

Differences must never be permitted to rise; their very shadow must be removed before it darkens our path. The mind must not be allowed to cherish an ill-feeling towards any other human being.

I was the first to point out, years ago, the importance of education in securing peace. I called attention to the influence of Christmas toys, of children's story-books and school-books of history, of the behavior of young folks when in foreign countries, etc.

I want to call attention at this time to another subject, of great influence in the relationship of nations, I mean the immigration of individuals, sometimes of large portions of one nation into another. This is nowhere else so prominent as here in America. We admire the energy with which the United States are progressing. Sometimes to us of calmer temperament it seems that your haste is a feverish one. We Europeans ought to send over those of our people who would really help you—help you to modify your speed, perhaps. But, alas! we suffer our worst elements to come, to fill the asylums and charitable institutions of this unselfish, hospitable land. This I have seen in visiting such establishments.

To examine the reasons for such mass emigration would be a

worthy subject for a peace congress. It would bring to light many a sore place in the social system, existing in every country, though in different form. To find remedies for such evils would be a beneficent task for the peace societies. If the conditions of the homelife were endurable, people would stay in their native place and help to improve it. Travelling into other countries, then, would be to know and to assist others, not to crowd them out. Discontent with the state of things at home and attraction by the splendor and ease seen abroad are mostly a *fata-morgana*. There are everywhere difficulties to be overcome, the root of which lies for the most part in our imperfections.

The first lesson a human being ought to learn is "to know himself." The prevailing spirit is to throw the blame for every evil on others, to find the mote in another's eye and not to observe the beam in one's own. It is this spirit among nations which produces war, and the fear of war causes the constant increase of standing armies. This primary cause of war and of the curses connected with it can be uprooted only through a sound moral education founded on the religion that teaches us to overcome evil with good and to love all men as brethren and children of one common Heavenly Father.

MRS. MARY FROST ORMSBY, of New York, was next introduced and addressed the Congress as follows:

THE PEACE FLAG.

You, my friends, who listened to the poet of the Peace Congress, the other evening, heard his rhythmic allusion to an epoch in history, when, after enumerating the pioneers of Peace, he said, "Long the trumps have been sounding," and added:

"New Italy heard them and summoned from far
The nobles of peace to her dead halls of war;
And the White-Bordered Flag of America lay
On the old gladiator, immortal the day!"

This is, my friends, the veritable flag of which Mr. Butterworth wrote (pointing to the flag which the secretary was holding before the audience). It was presented to Italy as a flag of peace at the time of the International Peace Congress, held there in 1891. It was carried there by your speaker, who was a delegate from the United States, and, after being formally received by the Congress, it was placed by the officials in the arms of the statue of a gladiator, which was on the platform, and the silken folds of this glorious peace flag fell down gracefully over the cleft arm of the gladiator, Strigile. This statue occupied a niche on the right of the President of the Congress, His Excellency Ruggero Bonghi of Rome, Italy. This is, also, my hearers, the first peace flag ever made, and the prophecy has been uttered by our poet, "White-

Bordered flag of liberty, that hence the pilot of the race shall be." Let this prophecy prove true. It may be interesting to those unacquainted with its history to know some of the facts of the conception and design of the White-Bordered Flag of liberty and peace, especially of this *particular* flag. This, when it went on its mission to Italy, performed its part in the third International Peace Congress, there in session in 1891; it was carried afterward to the Berne Peace Congress in 1892, to which the speaker was again appointed a delegate, but, being unable to go herself, she was obliged to appoint a proxy to officiate. It has now come back across the ocean to be unfurled at this Congress, the fifth International one in the history of the world. Whilst remaining here in waiting for this session it has been, as you remember, on July 4th, raised in front of the Administration Building by the speaker at the request of the municipal authorities of Chicago. That Fourth of July seemed to be the foretaste of the millennium of peace. The lesson of peace was taught there to those gathered together in the White City; there, where they have come, as one of the exhibitors said, "to put their jewels in your golden setting;" there, where so many flags of all nations were in the sunlight, like a rainbow of promise, blending their colors, thereby telling the story that above all nations is humanity; there, on July 4th of this year, simultaneously with the unfurling of the "Old Glory" flag, this original peace flag floated out from the flag-pole, telling the story of *peace* to the *world*. The different soldiers of diverse nationalities gathered in Jackson Park looked on that scene in admiration, and all the use they made of their artillery was to punctuate the pauses. Thus let the death-dealing element of war forever be relegated to the history of the past. May arbitration reign instead of annihilation as the means of settling difficulties.

You have heard from two of our esteemed officers, Dr. Trueblood, from our own beloved country, and Dr. Darby, from our mother across the sea, that it was during the first years of this century that the first four Peace Societies were formed almost simultaneously. Is it not, then, most appropriate that, whilst our western brethren here were planning this "Dream City," that exceeds in beauty anything that poet, artist or orator can describe, our eastern brethren were assembled on the 399th anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus and were consulting how *they* could properly commemorate the event. The place of meeting was in Independence Hall, so memorable in history as a cradle of liberty. The result of that meeting was a resolution to adopt a plan for a peace flag; so that when nations sent their delegates to consult about international matters there might be one emblem for them all, which emblem should teach the brotherhood of man, and at the same time not eliminate the love of one's own country. In fact, it was an emblem suggested by the Psalmist's lesson, "How blessed it is for brethren to dwell

together in unity. It is like the dews that descended on Hermon." Mr. Henry Pettit, as a result of this meeting, designed this peace flag, which you here see. If the national flag be white then border it with gold, so that there will yet be a difference in color between the flag and the border. The reason for this choice is that gold signifies merit and worth.

At the time of this meeting the ladies asked what they could do. As Mr. Pettit's plan was unanimously adopted, the ladies were told that they could make the first peace flag; and this, friends, is their work made at that time, the original flag of peace, designed on the 399th anniversary of the discovery of America. Not only did the ladies make this flag, but the silk was from their own manufacturing company of Pennsylvania. It was a woman's silk worms that made the silk; women wove it, women spun it, women sewed it, and it was a woman who carried it to Rome, your speaker, who brings to you this message of peace from the Eternal City. When it was carried thither it was at the time of the difficulty between the United States and Italy. Many of the members of that Congress were members of the Italian Parliament. When asked by the writer what was desired of the United States to settle the estrangement caused by the New Orleans matter, they said they regretted, first, that they had any countrymen that had disgraced Italy by any such conduct as that of the Italians who figured in that tragedy; and, secondly, that the United States, having made widows and orphans, did not do something for those they had bereaved. This fact was communicated back to the United States, and Mr. Thomas B. Bryan about this time coming as Commissioner from the United States to negotiate with Italy to send exhibits, this whole series of circumstances resulted in an amicable adjustment by the payment of an indemnity, and political harmony was again restored. It is the earnest prayer of all lovers of peace that this emblem of peace may forever in the future, as in the past, carry this lesson of arbitration; and that war shall reign no more.

Already the nations that are bringing the wealth of the countries to the White City by the Lake have also peace flags with their significant white borders in our Peace Exhibit in the Liberal Arts Building. You will see there thirteen clustered together in one bouquet of beauty, surmounting the picture of this original peace flag. What a galaxy of hope! The poet of our Congress, in rhythm, enunciates this prophecy:—"Who shall it be? What power shall bid war cease? *Thou* answerest me, White-Bordered Flag of Peace! O white evangel, by the angels rolled out of the sky, thy signal we behold."

One suggestion and I have finished:—The hope of a nation is in the rising generation; it is the youth of our own country who hold the destiny of our country in their hands. It was an interesting picture to see the enthusiasm, intelligence and patriotism

manifest in the Congress of Representative Youth assembled here a few weeks ago by invitation of President Bonney. There were forty-five hundred appointed delegates, and the United States of America need not tremble for her destiny if her future be entrusted to consecrated youth. The enthusiasm with which they greeted this flag (for President Bonney sent for me to tell them its history) leads me to offer as a suggestion that, instead of the simple Stars and Stripes, we adopt this peace flag to float over every school-house in the land. It is an object lesson potent and expressive. The children will be no less patriotic if by encircling our glorious Stars and Stripes with a white border we thereby teach them the lessons of peace. We are now teaching them to love war, not only by our military schools, but by inculcating in their minds a love of the glitter of uniforms, by constant references to successes in sanguinary conflicts as the crown of a victor.

Let this Columbian year forever settle this question, that war will no longer be narrated as bringing glory to the conquering hero.

MRS. EDWARD ROBY, of Chicago, whose name was on the program, in a letter to the Secretary, explaining that her absence from the Congress was caused by severe sickness in her family, said that:

"Surely none should take so great an interest in peace as the women of the world who have to bear the sons whose bones are left to bleach on the battlefield, or are left to live out their lives in one of the Soldiers' Homes.

"The mothers must bear patiently the burden of sorrow and become members of the Woman's Corps of the Bleeding Heart. As a member of that corps I bid you God-speed to-day."

MRS. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD of Washington, D. C., was introduced, and spoke as follows:

I have been asked to speak on organizations of women for the promotion of peace. I do not know any thing about such organizations. I have never been connected with them. My work has always been in connection with men. I was brought up on the farm with the boys, helping to milk the cows and do other kinds of farm work. I had to do my full share of it all. It was so in the school. I was educated side by side with the boys in the same classes. In the practice of law it has been the same. I have been associated in the court-room and the law office with men. So it has been in the peace work. Men and women have worked side by side in the peace societies to do away with the dreadful evils of war. The burdens and evils of war men and women have to bear together and they ought to work together to remove them. They can do more together than they can if they work separately. There are organizations of women who work alone in the peace propaganda, and they are doing a grand work. But many of the

noble women engaged in the cause, — the Baroness Von Suttner, Miss Peckover, Madame Griess Traut and others work side by side with the men.

Women ought all to throw their influence on the side of peace. They are the ones that suffer most by war, when their brothers and husbands and sons are taken away to be torn in pieces by shot and shell. The women of the world ought to rise up in mass and say that war shall be no more.

DR. W. EVANS DARBY, of London, said :

MRS. BAILEY, LADIES and GENTLEMEN — I dislike to take up the time of the Congress, but I am sure you will forgive me for you will remember I am one of the few representatives from Europe, and that, in a sense, I have a special duty to perform which possibly does not fall to others. I rise with considerable hesitation and temerity. I come from a continent where women hardly occupy the same place that they do in America ; where, if a lady stood up and talked about what the sex would do, she would be looked at askance by the people. You have heard what the ladies of America have done and you will know when I give you the information that some very strong ideas exist on the other side of the water as to the question of the power of women in certain fields. When I listened to the previous speaker I had very vividly recalled to my memory an interesting conversation I had with one of the noblest workers in our cause, on my way to the Congress at Rome. We were spending Sunday afternoon together in a hotel at Turin talking about a variety of subjects, and among other things the position of women in America came up. My friend looked at me with a peculiar twinkle of the eye, and with a little touch of irony he said, " Well, don't you know that in America in the marriage service, we generally promise to love, honor and obey our wives? "

I rise, from a grave sense of duty, especially as a lady well qualified to speak for the English Peace Society is absent.

I am sure she would have contributed to the wisdom of this Congress ; at any rate to the pathos, earnestness, beauty and richness of this meeting. A very large portion of the peace society work in England is done by the ladies. I might mention Miss Peckover, a lady who has not only devoted her time and wealth, but, what is infinitely better, herself, to the great work of advocating peace. Then there is Mrs. Henry Richard, and many others who have worked nobly for our cause.

I want to express my hearty sympathy for the work of the ladies. I sympathize with what Mrs. Lockwood has said about removing all distinction between the sex in this our common work. I cannot stand here, however, without recollecting that there are great natural differences between the sexes which qualify men for doing one kind of work and women for doing another, — aye, a

finer and higher kind of work. In the rougher, sterner elements, the character of man is better adapted for arduous effort.

But all those qualities of keen insight, strong instinct, and finer feelings of the race are on the side of women; and they are the predominating forces after all. And then women have special opportunities for doing the work, and if they only knew it, they exert an influence far greater than that which would come from any promise in any marriage service about obeying the other side.

Our great writer Ruskin, who is looked upon as one of the great "cranks" of the age, as you say in America, because he dares to look straight at the truth, and say out the things that come to him, has said, "That the ladies really hold this whole question of peace and war in their hands, and if war should break the crockery in the china closet, man's master would very soon rise up and say we will have no more of this thing."

Then another suggestion has been made, that if when a declaration of war is made, the ladies would put on mourning, and refuse to take it off until peace was declared, that would very soon put an end to wars. Now there is a depth of truth behind Mr. Ruskin's pleasantry.

You ladies have the power to guide the men who control the sentiments of society, and create and direct public sentiment on these great questions; you have children in your hands at the ~~most plastic time of their growth~~, and, unconsciously perhaps, the children are drinking in all the influences which surround them in their daily lives. In the years of manhood and womanhood, and the declining period of life, the words that you speak, the spirit you manifest in the home will leave a powerful influence for good.

What a mighty power the mother has over the child! Why, the better qualities of a man always come from his mother. You never knew a great man who had not a good mother.

After all humanity is of a dual character; a man is not nearly so powerful alone, as when allied with a noble woman. Together they make up one whole, one the complement of the other. When they work together there are two hearts throbbing in one dual entity, and they accomplish a great deal more than either would singly. Then, speaking of man's work and woman's influence upon it, woman is to make the asylum where the weary workers may come in from their toils. I am afraid this is not so well appreciated in America where you have so many nice houses, as it is in England.

The strongest powers in history have been inspired by the women. Think of Helen of Troy and Cleopatra. When you take all these things into consideration you see the important place women have in the world's work, and especially in this great work for peace. You have the power, and if you use it rightly and judiciously you shall govern the world. You shall be the inspiration of the best

thoughts of men. You shall be behind the best work done by men. In this way, shall we most speedily reach the goal toward which we are all aspiring and which we shall assuredly reach.

I do not want to anticipate the discussion of to-morrow morning, by a reference to that latest triumph of the practical application of our principles, of which we have information this morning in the newspapers, but the Behring Sea Arbitration is a source of encouragement in connection with our common work.

It has been a great object lesson, on the other side of the water, to see great international problems speedily, satisfactorily, quietly and judiciously discussed before a great tribunal of arbitration, the proceedings of which are given in the press from day to day. It is one of the grand triumphs of the cause for which we labor, and it contains great promise for the future and a prophecy of the better time that is coming, when peace shall rule from shore to shore, when behind peace there shall be as its inspiration, a great love.

I have pleasure in standing upon this platform in this woman's meeting and expressing my intense sympathy with our sisters engaged in the great work.

MRS. J. C. LEMON, Oakland, Cal., said :

I have come here as a volunteer, for, as I understand, there is no representative from our beloved golden shores of California. You know California must be heard if only for a moment.

I wish to bring a word to you from the Indians of the Pacific slope, whom I more particularly represent. Our general study of botany carries my husband and myself all over the wilds of our western shores, from the borders of old Mexico on the south through the northern-most country. So you will bear with me for a moment when I say that the line of Peace work is one most deeply interesting to us. In our thirteen years of hand to hand work in these jagged mountains and wild plains, we have never carried among the Apaches, the Navajoes and among all the hostile Indians we have met, especially in Arizona and New Mexico, anything more warlike than our little sheath knife for the purpose of gathering bulbs and plants. In the rocky crags, the deep ravines, in every conceivable place,—among the cacti, in the caverns, wherever we have camped in between the rocks, we have met the Indians and never have we had any warlike action from them. Sometimes they would look surprised to see a man and woman walking side by side as we did in our work. They called us Medicine men and would follow us fifteen or twenty miles and bring their arms full of bulbs and plants and they were able to give us the Indian names for the medicine plants that we might have.

The Indians are to me the most interesting things in the world next to botany. We look upon them as children, because they are so transparent. These Indians naturally would not carry arms,

but they see the white man and the cowboy have their revolvers and they feel they must have some means of defence. The first thing an Indian does is to notice whether you are armed. If he finds you armed, you are regarded with suspicion. If you are unarmed, you are all right. Of course we have had some hair breadth escapes; we were reported as being scalped and burned. We were three weeks cut off from civilization hiding in caverns at a time when the Apaches were on the war path. When they are on the war path, then the white man's hand is against them and they will not stop at anything. But the white man is to blame for all the warlike propensities of the Indian. I think the Indians as they visit the World's Fair must experience a wonderful sensation as they view the wonderful progress which has been made in civilization.)

A. C. COTTON, of New Jersey, said: I have noticed the implements of war at the Fair grounds and I have been horrified. You know it is said in the old book, "That out of the mouths of the babes and sucklings, God has perfected praise," so I come before you, not as a scholar but as one who has been feeling earnestly in this matter of Peace for many years. In the adjoining Hall I heard a man say that we are bound to have Africa for the Lord Jesus Christ; if we cannot have it by peaceful means we will have it by force.

That speaker was followed by Mrs. May Sheldon who told how she had travelled through Africa amongst the dark savage races, unarmed and unharmed.

ALFRED H. LOVE, President of the Universal Peace Union (of Philadelphia), said:

MRS. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—This is the culmination of my aspirations of half a century. I have remained quiet during these two or three days and it has reminded me very much of the sight I saw in the war department over in the Exposition. One of the guards dressed very much like the military stationed himself alongside of some of these dummies that you see in the war department, and he stood perfectly motionless for several minutes. Persons would come up and say, "see how lifelike he looks." After a while their remarks became so pertinent and personal that he could stand it no longer and he burst right out. Now I am very much in the same condition, the spirit moves me and I can stand it no longer.

This is mother's day for peace. I believe my life has been molded by the best of mothers. First as a school boy. One day in the play-ground having a feeling that I had the right to throw my top where others would, there came blows upon me from one of my schoolmates and the blood flowed. I did not strike back but went home. Father who loved justice and was full of high regard for rights, in the spirit of the age, said, "Son, if thee don't go back and flog that boy so he will never be thy master again, I will

give thee a sound whipping." Mother stood by and said, "Alfred, thee knows I have always taught thee never to strike back. Thee go back and take some little present to that boy and treat him well, and see what effect it will have upon him." I debated the question and I obeyed my mother! The boy always respected me from that day.

Many years after when I had reached manhood, a little girl fell before me on the street. I took her to a physician and asked her name; she was a daughter of the boy that had struck me at school. I sent my regards by her to the father. A few days afterwards we met in a street car and he said, "Is this Alfred Love who picked up my daughter in the street, and the boy I struck at school?" "It is the same." Well the scene was a touching one. His apology was beautiful. And now comes the point,—I feel this great cause to be a woman's question,—the mothers of the race. We all love our children either girls or boys. We start them through life from the cradle through the school and the church. We teach these children from the same book and the same Divine law of truth: "Do not kill"; "Do not covet thy neighbor's goods"; "Do not strike, do not lie, do not steal". The same tuition to the two children starting on the pilgrimage through life. They arrive at manhood and womanhood. Our country says to the boy at eighteen: "If Congress declares war we need you; you are conscripted into the service of the country." Contrary to all the teachings of your mother, your Sunday-school, your church and your conscience, you are carried into a condition where you will lie and maim, destroy and kill; where you will steal from the enemy, cut off his supply of water and starve him to death. It is a mistake that our boys should be treated differently from our girls. We give them the same education: we start them in life, yet at that age of manhood or womanhood they seem to part company. Men may do these wicked deeds while you women are exempt from the military service. I do not believe in one code of morals for men and another for women! I want my girl and my boy to have life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and I want my boy to have the same advantages in life that my girl has. I am opposed to that system of government which compels men to leave their homes and trample under foot their early education, the teachings of their mothers and the inspiration of God, and engage in deadly warfare. It is a mistake and a crime. I feel it, because I have passed through the ordeal of being conscripted although I would not comply. While the good women of the land are working for equal rights, and for Woman Suffrage, we, on the other hand, should work for equal rights for men on this plan, against war and the military system of the day. Think of what is called that great institution, the Military Academy at West Point, where the very best young men of the country are taken and trained in the arts of war, from eighteen to twenty-five years of age. All this is out of harmony

with the true life. It is in opposition to marriage, and marriage is a sacred institution. It is a fearful state of Society that takes men out of walks of usefulness and civil pursuits and where they might make home "sweet home" and bring up children in the way they should go, and turn them aside into ways that are impure, unholy and criminal. Far out in our western country are strong men in barracks, away from home, from the family influence, from the marriage relation, serving no useful purpose, and doing no righteous thing. It is a prostitution of the creation: "In the image of God created he him."

HARRIET HOFFMAN BECKWITH, of Chicago, said:

MADAM PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — I feel this is one of the greatest honors, if not the greatest, of my life, to be present at this Peace Congress and listen to these speeches from these noble men and women who are fighting this bloodless war. I think it is a compliment to this cause to know that hundreds of people have come here day after day and sat patiently through the meetings of this Congress, showing their interest in the cause.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from England in regard to woman's sphere, but I make a plea for woman that she be allowed as broad a sphere as man, and when man allows her that sphere they will see what she can accomplish for peace. I remember reading in the papers when the Chilean affair was engaging our attention, how Frances Willard and thousands of women sent an appeal to the government that war should not take place. And I also remember reading a criticism from one of our prominent editors in which the question was asked, "Why don't the women mind their own business, and leave such affairs to men, who are capable and competent to settle them?" Now I believe that when woman's sphere shall be fully equal to man's such a question as that will never be raised. It has been said that women should not be allowed a part in the government because they are not able to go to war and fight, but I would answer that question, and it has, perhaps, been answered before, that while women do not go to war and do not fight, yet they have furnished the sons who have left their bodies to bleach on the fields of battle, and they have the highest right to speak on this question. I also honor men, for some of them have done much towards bringing about peace. I have in mind a Russian, the artist Verestschagin, whose paintings many of you have seen and noticed how they depict the terrible way in which war is carried on. His paintings were on exhibition here on this ground where this Art Palace now stands, in the old Exposition building. He has painted the battlefield in all its goryness. He has shown how the great Generals put the brave men in the front of the fray while they themselves remain at safe distances, how the kings and emperors remain back from the scene of danger, where they can see the ravages of war from a safe distance and not be harmed.

It has been the common soldiers who have given their lives, not the Generals and the Kings. Their wives, their mothers, their sisters should unite in protesting against war. Our children are taught patriotism, and are taught to reverence the flag of their country, and it is placed upon many of the towers of the school-houses and churches. It is well that they be taught to honor their flag, but at the same time they should feel that while honoring the flag of this nation, they should honor the flag of all nations and should have a feeling of good will toward all nations. They should not think theirs the only flag entitled to honor, but they should have respect for the flags of all nations. Then the time will be hastened when we shall think well of our neighbors and love them as ourselves, and war shall be no more.

Adjourned.

FIFTH SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16TH, 3 P. M.

MEETING OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL PEACE CONFERENCE.

As a special session provided for in the program of the Peace Congress, this body assembled at 3 P. M., August 16, 1893. The Conference was called to order by Rev. Dr. W. A. Campbell of Richmond, Virginia, chairman of the Executive Committee. The meeting was led in prayer by the Rev. Dr. Wm. H. Roberts of Philadelphia.

After the reading of the roll of the delegates, appointed by various ecclesiastical bodies to represent them in the Conference, the report of the Executive Committee was read and is as follows :

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Executive Committee of the Ecclesiastical Peace Conference, held in New York City, December 7, 1891, respectfully report to the Conference in session in the City of Chicago, August 16, 1893.

The design of the movement, which we represent, is to bring to bear the combined influence of the religious bodies of Christendom upon the governments of Christian nations, by means of petitions, with a view to securing the substitution of arbitration for war in settling international disputes.

The religious body, which first took action in this matter, adopted a petition, to be addressed to the several governments of Christian nations, and asked the representatives of other churches to concur with them. In the address laying this matter before these bodies, the importance and hopefulness of the undertaking are thus set forth :

“ Notwithstanding the healthful influence of Christianity in all those lands that have received the gospel, it is a lamentable fact that still international questions are referred to the arbitrament of arms. Many Christian countries maintain large standing armies and navies, that constantly menace the peace of the world, and are a grievous burden to the people that support them. Whilst some international differences are settled by peaceful arbitration, this is not recognized as the only and final resort for the adjudication of these questions. War and bloodshed are still the means to which Christian nations look to right their wrong.

“ We believe that among the Christian people of our own and

other lands there is a strong sentiment in opposition to this deplorable evil, and in favor of referring all matters of international claims to some suitable tribunal for peaceful solution. And further, we entertain the hope that if the influence of this sentiment were properly brought to bear upon the governments of these Christian nations it would greatly further this desirable end.

“ We therefore ask you to join us in petitioning all the governments of Christian countries to take measures to banish warfare as the means of settling the strifes that arise between nations, and to substitute a more rational and Christian tribunal.”

The petition, thus laid before them for concurrence, was adopted by a number of the representative bodies of leading Christian denominations; and their delegates constituted the Conference held in New York City in December, 1891. But whilst it then appeared that considerable progress had been made in getting the united voice of Christian churches in behalf of the object aimed at, it was manifest that much more remained to be done. The Conference therefore took steps for the prosecution of the work, and for the assembling of the present Conference in the City of Chicago. Its action is embodied in a series of resolutions, which the Executive Committee published in a circular to use in their correspondence, entitled “ An Ecclesiastical Movement in behalf of Arbitration,” a copy of which is herewith substituted.

The Executive Committee, organized under the fifth of the resolutions above referred to, appointed, as directed, the other committees provided for, which are as printed on the notice issued for this meeting.

The committee appointed to that service had the petition translated and printed in various languages. It is addressed to the heads of thirty-one governments, in the respective language of each, except that the copy addressed to Russia is in French. A set of the copies of this petition in the various languages is herewith submitted.

A PETITION.

To be addressed to the Several Governments of the Christian Nations of the World.

To [Government addressed.]

[Name of body sending petition.]

wishes you grace, mercy and peace.

We in coöperation with other Christian bodies, humbly memorialize you, as the guardians of your people, in behalf of peaceful arbitration as a means of settling questions that arise between nations. The spectacle that is presented of Christian nations facing each other with heavy armaments, ready upon provocation to go to war and settle their differences by bloodshed or conquest, is, to say the least, a blot upon the fair name of Christian. We cannot contemplate without the deepest sorrow the horrors of war, involving the reckless sacrifice of human life, that should be held sacred, bitter distress in many households, the destruction of valuable property, the hin-

dering of education and religion, and the general demoralizing of the people.

Moreover, the maintaining of a heavy war force, though war be averted, withdraws multitudes from their homes and the useful pursuits of peace, and imposes a heavy tax upon the people for its support. And further, let it be borne in mind, that wars do not settle causes of dispute between nations on principles of right and justice, but upon the barbaric principle of the triumph of the strongest.

We are encouraged to urge this cause upon your consideration by the fact that much has already been accomplished; as, for example, by the arbitration of Geneva in the Alabama case, and by the deliberations of the American Conference at Washington, not to mention other important cases. It will be a happy day for the world when all international disputes find peaceful solutions; and this we earnestly seek.

As to the method of accomplishing this end, we make no suggestions, but leave that to your superior intelligence and wisdom in matters of State policy.

We invoke upon rulers and people the richest blessings of the Prince of Peace.

Your committee addressed to the committees of Correspondence for the several denominations such suggestions and instructions, as they thought necessary for the efficient performance of the duties assigned those committees.

These committees, with varying diligence, have laid the petition before a number of ecclesiastical bodies and secured its adoption. So far as we are informed, it has been adopted in every instance in which its purport was so explained, as to bring it intelligently before the body to which it was sent. But to reach representatives of all the churches in Christendom and present any measure before them with such influential backing as to secure for it intelligent consideration, is a vast undertaking, however; as many of the highest representative bodies meet only after intervals of several years, it cannot be done in a short time. Consequently the petition has not yet been presented to the representatives of all the churches in the United States, and to but few in other countries.

The sets of the copies of the petition, officially signed, so far as they have been returned to us, are herewith presented, that the Conference, in accordance with the purpose for which it was called, may "take steps to bring the petitions before each government through such influential persons as will secure for them favorable consideration." They are from the following bodies:

Southern Baptist Convention of the United States, General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of United States, General Convention of the Reformed Episcopal Church, London Yearly Meeting of Friends, Baltimore Yearly Meeting of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends, Philanthropic Union of the Religious Society of Friends, German Evangelical Synod of North America, General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, Evangelical Lutheran Synod of South Carolina, Michigan Conference of the Methodist Episcopal

Church, Florida Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, South Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, South, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, Reformed Dutch Church in America, American Universalist Church, Religious Society of Friends in Ireland, North Georgia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

We have information that other bodies have adopted the Petition, but they have not yet made return to us of the papers signed. The Council of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, approved the Petition, and recommended its adoption by the Churches connected with the Alliance. This embraces nearly all the Churches of the Presbyterian System throughout the world. The Primate of the Episcopal Church of Scotland wrote to a member of the Committee of Correspondence for the Episcopal Church: "The Scottish Bishops requested me to inform you of their sincere sympathy with the movement which they will do all in their power to promote."

As the influence of the Petition must depend in a large measure upon our securing general concurrence in it, your committee believes it is important to prosecute the work still farther. If this be determined on, we ask that the Conference make provision for the expenses of the work. Hitherto the members of this committee have borne the expenses themselves with the help of small amounts raised among friends in Richmond, Virginia. The work could have been more efficiently prosecuted if we had had the necessary funds at command. It will probably be two or three years yet before action on the part of all the bodies, whose co-operation we are seeking, can be secured. If, therefore, another Conference be not called, and we see no sufficient reason for the assembling of another, we ask that provision be made for the expenses of the work for two or three years.

We recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

[These resolutions were referred, and as modified and adopted appear below.]

On behalf of the Executive Committee.

W. A. CAMPBELL, Chairman,
W. H. PLEASANTS, Secretary.

RICHMOND, VA., Aug. 8, 1893.

Some explanations of the report and statements as to the progress of the work and its prospects for the future were made by the chairman of the committee. Whilst the subject was under consideration, this ecclesiastical movement was heartily endorsed in

short earnest speeches by Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., Secretary of the American Peace Society, Dr. J. Müller of Upsala, Sweden, Mr. C. S. Smith, Rev. Wm. Evans Darby, LL. D., Secretary of the Peace Society, London, and Rev. Wm. Henry Roberts, D.D., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

A business committee was formed, consisting of Dr. W. H. Roberts, W. J. Onahan, Esq., Hon. J. E. Ward, Rt. Rev. Samuel Fallows, Dr. W. A. Campbell, Dr. J. H. Elliott, and Dr. J. W. Heidt.

To this committee were referred the resolutions and recommendations of the report. To the same committee was referred the matter of the appointment of suitable persons in each country to present the Petition.

AUGUST 17TH, 9 O'CLOCK, A. M.

The Conference re-assembled, and received and adopted the report of the business committee.

First, the resolutions referred to committee were reported back with additions and adopted, and are as follows:

1. That the work in hand be prosecuted with a view to securing the adoption of the Petition to governments, by the representatives of those churches of Christendom that have not already adopted it.

2. That Rev. W. A. Campbell, D. D., W. H. Pleasants, Esq., Col. C. O'B. Cowardin, John S. Ellett, Esq., Hon. J. Taylor Ellyson, Rev. Moses D. Hoge, D. D., Rev. Paul L. Menzel, Rev. P. A. Peterson, D. D. and Rt. Rev. A. M. Randolph, D. D., be appointed as an Executive Committee to carry out the above purpose, with authority to fill vacancies in their own number; and that this committee be authorized to receive and expend such sums as may be raised for this work, and to compensate such persons as may be appointed to service in connection with the objects of the Conference.

3. That this Executive Committee direct the work of correspondence through the present Committees of Correspondence, with such changes or additions as may seem to them advisable.

4. That a Finance Committee of six persons be appointed, with power to add to their number, to secure the funds needed for the work of the Conference, said committee to pay such as may be secured to the Executive Committee: John Hall, D.D., LL.D., Wm. H. Roberts, D.D., LL.D., Josiah W. Leeds, Esq., Philadelphia, John S. Kennedy, Esq., New York, Col. E. W. Cole, Nashville, George W. Childs, Esq. Philadelphia.

Secondly, in the matter of the appointment of suitable persons in the several countries to take charge of the petitions adopted by the churches, the business committee recommended the following, which was adopted:

The Conference in order to carry out the main design for which it was called, namely, "to bring the petitions before each government through such influential persons as will secure for them favorable consideration," empowers the Executive Committee to organize a committee in each country to represent it in the accomplishment of this purpose.

The Executive Committee is instructed to place the respective petitions in the hands of the several committees appointed by it.

The committee for each country is requested to co-operate with the Committees of Correspondence in securing the farther adoption of the Petition.

Each committee is authorized to present to the government the petitions placed in its hands through such deputation as it may select.

It is left to the discretion of each committee, whether the petitions already adopted shall be presented at an early day, or, be withheld for the addition of others that may be expected; but the Conference would advise that they be not long withheld, except for urgent reasons.

In case the Executive Committee shall fail to secure in any country a committee to take charge of the petitions, it is authorized to forward them to the government through such other channels as may be deemed best.

The Conference by resolution expressed its hearty appreciation of the accommodations and facilities afforded for its meeting by the World's Congress Auxiliary and to Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood for arranging for the Conference as a special session of the Peace Congress and for many services which he rendered.

The Conference then adjourned.

SIXTH SESSION.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17TH, 10 A. M.

The Congress reassembled in the Hall of Columbus at 10 A. M.

Rev. Wm. H. Roberts, Secretary of the Presbyterian General Assembly, led in prayer.

William Penn Nixon, Editor of the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, was introduced as chairman of the morning and on taking the chair said :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — I certainly feel highly complimented in being called upon to preside over this meeting this morning. I do not know any organization whose objects are more in accord with those of my own heart than that of those people who contend against the terrors of the battlefield and for the beauties of peace. (Applause.) As I am not accustomed to thinking and talking on my feet, if you will excuse me, I will read what I have to say.

This Peace Congress is to be congratulated that Chicago was chosen as the place of its meeting, and August, 1893, as the time for its assembling. The glad tidings of "Peace on Earth" is for all the nations and at the present time there is no place where the ear and eye of all nations can be reached so easily as right here on the shore of Lake Michigan. The fame of our suburban "White City" has gone over the entire world, and representatives of all nations are making it a chief point of observation. Law-makers, rulers, sightseers, scientists and students of all kinds are here either in thought or person and in a receptive mood. They are looking for something new, a new thought, a new idea, something they have not found elsewhere. It is the great opportunity for those who advocate great ideas for the happiness of all peoples. The law of love for which you plead though older than man is still ever new in its varied applications and I know of no place and no time that its preaching should have a greater effect, or meet with a more prompt response than here and now. If the law of love, which in its comprehensive embrace takes captive both justice and mercy, is ever to spread over the whole earth it will be by securing lodgment in the heart of individuals in every nation. First the one is touched with a true spirit and then gradually the many; this is the law of the progress of elevation and refinement. Hence it is that I congratulate you on the time and place of your sessions.

You are to be congratulated further that in the midst of your deliberations so grand an example of the effect of such labors as

yours should be the centre of the thought of the whole world. The decision of the greatest Arbitration court ever organized has just been promulgated. A hundred years ago and the Behring Sea case would have been settled at the point of the sword, and probably with great destruction of human life and at greater expense than all the seal fisheries of the world are worth. Now it has been settled by arbitration, the honor and dignity of both nations have been maintained, and the peace of the world maintained. The rights of each nation to the controversy have been settled and provision made for preserving the seals. It is true our orators have been given no opportunity to glorify the prowess and bravery of our troops either on land or water; neither have fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers nor other loved ones had occasion to weep and mourn for those who came not back to them, or those who remained for life dependent on those they should have supported and protected. The horrors of war are unspeakable, the beauties of peace are beyond description.

It must be that wars will come but woe to him by whom they are brought about, and blessings on those who make them as few and far apart as possible. National Arbitration is the stepping stone, the harbinger of the far off day when "there shall be war no more" and you do wisely in advocating it.

Twice have the two greatest nations of the world set the example to all the others of arbitrating their difficulties instead of going to war about them. It is true they are the most enlightened nations and are bound by ties of consanguinity, but except for such agitation as you are engaged in — but for the earnest, unselfish, persevering advocates of peace from early in the nineteenth century to the present, even the action of these nations would have been impossible. It is reasonable to suppose that their example will be influential, and that the great nations will resort to arbitration rather than to war for the settlement of their differences. Economy, if no higher motive, will lead them thus to act. The tremendous expense and great destructiveness of modern warfare will work for peace. But even when the great nations agree to settle their own difficulties by arbitration your work will not be ended. It will have been only begun. Until the spirit of love, of justice, of mercy prevail among the nations to such an extent as to protect the weaker from the stronger your work must go on. Why should Siam or any other oriental nation appeal in vain for justice against any of the great powers? So long as she or any others similarly situated cry out in vain against acknowledged injustice there will be work for peace societies. I wish I could foresee the time when your advocacy would not be needed, when peace will prevail because everywhere men love it and hate strife, but I fear yours is an unending contest. Like the parallel lines your progress forever approaches but never reaches the point where you can lay off your armor with the thought that all has been accomplished. But

though that desired point may never be reached the world will be better and happier for your efforts, and I bid you God-speed in your great and good work.

THE CHAIRMAN: General C. H. Howard has a matter that he will introduce by direction of the Business Committee.

GEN. HOWARD: In recognition of this great event, the news of which came to us yesterday, the triumph of our principles anew in the settlement of the Behring Sea controversy, your Business Committee have prepared a dispatch to be sent to the Queen of Great Britain and to the President of the United States. I have the honor to move the adoption of this message as the sentiment of this body, and that a committee of three of our number be appointed by our chairman to sign the dispatches.

MESSAGE.

To her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and to Grover Cleveland, President of the United States: The World's Peace Congress of Chicago sends equal greetings to Great Britain and America on the triumph of arbitration as a substitute for war, exemplified in the recent Behring Sea decision, cementing the friendship of both nations and full of happiest augury for mankind. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen—You have heard the resolution. Those in favor of the adoption of the resolution will rise and stand. It is unanimously adopted. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the Business Committee has been asked to nominate this committee to sign the resolution, and he will do so.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I will nominate Mr. Robert Treat Paine, Dr. W. Evans Darby and Mr. Alfred H. Love to sign and send this message.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first paper on the program of the Congress this morning is "A Military Man's View of Arbitration," by General Charles H. Howard. (Applause.)

GEN. HOWARD: I would not have any one imagine that I think for a moment that those who are sitting before me need any additional arguments on this great question. I cannot feel that I am presenting even a military man's point of view as any instruction to you who hear me. But there are two points that I have selected, which perhaps when treated from a military point of view may furnish new force to the old argument for those whom we need to bring

with us in this great cause. I have noted that arbitration has often settled more than one point. It seems that in the Geneva arbitration five points that might, under some circumstances, have been the cause of war, were settled. It seems to me that we cannot magnify the importance of this triumph which is before us at this moment, and I hardly like to turn your thought one moment from the special subject that is to be presented to us to-day, namely, what can we do to bring about the establishment of a permanent tribunal to settle these great questions. On my way here this morning I had illustrated, in a little conversation with a neighbor, one way in which [perhaps some military points of view may aid us in bringing the public sentiment of the country to us. We were talking of the improvements of the implements of war. This gentleman suggested to me that it was not impossible at all that we might come to see two armies both utterly destroyed by dynamite. Just a moment's thought of that I think illustrates well the absurdity, the utter absurdity of appealing to such a tribunal as that in this period of reason. But in order that I might keep myself within the bounds of the short time allotted I have noted down on these two points what I have to say.

The subject assigned me —“Reasons for Arbitration from the Point of View of a Military Man”—admits of a much more elaborate treatment than the time for a single paper would permit. I have therefore selected two special fields of observation: One, the modern appliances of warfare with their increased and constantly increasing facilities for killing; the other, the history of wars and battles as they are written for popular use. My thought is that a military man or a man whose experience has made him a participator and personal observer of battles will take a different view of these two fields of observation from that taken by most other persons and hence may derive not perhaps new reasons for arbitration but add to the old and well established reasons new force.

[It has been argued that the perfection of the implements of modern warfare, and especially their enormous destructive power would diminish war. The history of nations to the present does not prove this. The fact that science has been so applied that every battle fought must mean a holocaust of human sacrifice does not prevent rulers from declaring war, nor does it prevent the people through their legislative bodies from voting the funds to create and equip armies. It does not even prevent volunteer enlistments and the filling up of depleted ranks after war has actually begun. But on the other hand the vast attainments of applied science in the arts of warfare, if fully comprehended with their possible results, supply a ground for a new and convincing appeal to all rational beings to take steps to prevent wars. Mere statistics, however cumulative and cogent in their application, do not always convince, much less stir to action. An exhibition

of modern appliances of war, such as may be seen at the Columbian Exposition, will have more effect upon the mind and be longer remembered. To see these tools of destruction in use would leave an impression still more indelible.

In like manner the history of wars as usually written does not tend to prevent their repetition. The ardor and beauty of patriotism are depicted. The romance and glory of campaigns and battles are made to glow in the narrative. Courage, heroism and self-sacrifice are glorified as they deserve to be. History as hitherto written only helps on the infatuation, which

“Seeks the bubble reputation in the cannon’s mouth.”

Unless mankind shall produce a war literature different from that of the historian as now known and read, Whittier’s lines will continue to be both historic and prophetic :

“Still shall the glory and the pomp of war
 Along their train the shouting millions draw;
 Still dusty Labor to the passing brave
 His cap shall doff, and Beauty’s kerchief wave;
 Still shall the bard to valor tune his song,
 Still Hero-worship kneel before the strong.”

But the measureless suffering of the field, the hearts wrung at home, the orphans and widows made and the aged fathers and mothers going down with sorrow to the grave — more than this, worse than this, the multiplication of vices innumerable, of crimes, the destruction of right habits, the breaking down of characters, the general lowering of the moral standards — what historians even attempt a portrayal of these results? The actual experience and personal observation of a military man must take in all these. Divested of the glamour of romance they can but afford a true basis, a basis not given by ordinary history, for an appeal to persons of reason, of conscience and of humane sympathies to take action, in this nineteenth century day, to prevent wars.

[In looking upon the perfected enginery of war, therefore, at the Columbian Exposition, shall we not view it with a purpose beyond that of mere wondering curiosity? What should be some of its lessons? May we not profitably mingle with the sight-seeing some recollections of actual war? If by so doing we may learn to read between the lines in reading history, it will be a gain for humanity; but still farther, if the Columbian quadri-centennial celebration shall foster the conviction that wars ought now to cease; and, above all, should it inaugurate a world-wide movement to establish an international tribunal to which may be referred all disputes and differences which have in time past been the occasions of war, and so reduce to the minimum the possibilities of war, it would be an end worthy of the Christian hero whose achievements we have undertaken to celebrate.] It would be worthy of the high moral purposes and the humane endeavors that characterize our period

of history. It would make real what has been the dream of the great prophets and seers from the day of Isaiah until that of Hugo, Tennyson and Whittier.

It does not require military education or experience to appreciate the wonderful attainments of science in the manufacture of the war implements to be seen at the Exposition. But some such thoughts as have been indicated of the profounder meaning and suggestiveness of these exhibits may deepen our interest in them and enable us to take away an impression more permanent and, we may hope, more useful to mankind. Take, for example, the Krupp gun building. The magnificence of some of these engines of war and the appalling record of their performance approach the sublime. Think of a gun for coast defence forty-eight feet long, seventeen-inch bore, weight, 140 tons; weight of carriage, 150 tons. Then think of what it can do. It shoots twenty miles and has pierced steel plates two feet thick at nine miles. Each projectile is five feet long. The primary purpose of the gun is to destroy war-ships, but beside the steel-pointed shell for this purpose it shoots steel shrapnels filled with small balls—3000 in each. This shrapnel shell bursts and the balls are scattered, hurled with great velocity, so that besides the destructive power of the steel fragments of the shell is added that of all these 3000 bullets—equal to the muskets of three regiments. Indeed, few regiments contain 1000 effective men. Here is, then, in one projectile, the killing power of the rifles of an entire brigade.

Turn away for a few moments from this enormous specimen of what inventive genius and mechanical skill have accomplished in the art of war and let me take you to one or two battle incidents to bring more clearly to view the possible effectiveness of such a projectile. We read of the number of regiments and brigades engaged in a certain battle and of the number of killed and wounded on both sides, but how often these figures are merely so many tables of arithmetic. It is a different matter to feel the thud of a bullet. On the first day of June, 1862, at the battle of Fair Oaks, the speaker thus—in a feeling way—took the measurement of one minnie ball. It was scarcely an inch in length, but the impression left, thirty-one years ago, is in more senses than one, vivid to this day. Your imagination may already have suggested what would have been the effect of the five-foot monster, weighing 2500 pounds, had it offered itself for measurement in like manner. You would have been saved the infliction of this paper.

Crowded into that one summer morning were one or two other personal incidents which may help to give the true significance to historic figures—so many wounded—so many killed. Before our brigade was fully engaged, in passing to the left where firing had begun, I met four men tenderly bearing in a blanket a wounded officer. In a moment I learned it was the Colonel in command of the 81st Pennsylvania Regiment—my friend, a beloved and trusted officer. He was already dead.

A little later in the morning my own brother received a rifle ball in the elbow joint. It went crashing through the joint and lodged in the upper bone of the arm. His arm was amputated that afternoon. How little does the simple statement of these facts convey as to the pain endured, as to the agony of the hearts in the far-off home, as to a maimed body for life in the one instance, and in the other a widowed home with all its hopes and joys withered and blasted? How little is even hinted of the sore, sad hearts, that day, of the comrades closely associated with those struck down.

Take any battle of the war, and like personal experiences were passed through and like scenes enacted. At Fredericksburg my college classmate fell while bravely commanding his Company. Then came back to me, as comes now, the memory of joyous, hopeful student days — of a handsome, intellectual face. The light of a noble life had been quenched in its very morning. At Chancellorsville, in the midst of the storm of the battle, the thunder and crash of artillery, my orderly came to me and said: "Captain Dessauer is shot. He is lying in the road yonder." Captain Dessauer was an aide of our staff and was my tent-mate. At Gettysburg another of our military family, Captain Griffith, whom we all loved, was shot while riding beside me. I saw that he turned pale and when he said he was wounded in the side I put my arm about him to sustain him as we rode back to find an ambulance. He lived a few days — long enough to see his wife, who came from Philadelphia. But our army moved on and I could not even stay to speak a word of comfort to her.

Such battle incidents and what they suggest are the history between the lines. I have given but two or three in the battles named. Think of how this kind of narrative might be multiplied by all the battles of one war of four years and varied by each participant. Then ponder the ominous figures:

At Fredericksburg: Total Union losses officially reported, 16,030; Confederate, 12,281. At Chancellorsville: Union, 12,353; Confederate, 4576. At Gettysburg: Union, 23,186; Confederate, 30,621.

Totals for the War of the Rebellion in the Union Armies: Killed, 44,000; Died from disease, 186,000; Died in prison, 26,000; Died from wounds, 49,000; Wounded, 280,000; Captured and missing, 185,000. Aggregate of Union losses, 585,000,

The aggregate of Confederate loss could not be far different. In round numbers the grand aggregate of loss of men to the country has been put at one million (1,000,000). The sum total of pain, of agony of soul, of prolonged suffering and life-long bereavement, who can compute? Do you find it noted in any history? If not, your history fails to bring to you its quota of argument in favor of arbitration as a substitute for war.

Come back to the Krupp gun building. This steel-pointed projectile, weighing a ton, can pierce the armor of a vessel like the

Victoria or the Camperdown at a distance of nine miles. Its force and penetrating power at a less distance is still greater and has been carefully tested and recorded. There are in this exhibit a number of other coast guns and ship guns whose possibilities of performance are equally wonderful. We have lately seen how quickly a great armored vessel could become a helpless hulk and go to the bottom with its human freight. With a shudder one thinks of the results if such a projectile as has been described should strike any vessel of war that is afloat.

One "quick-firing gun" of this exhibit fires forty shots per minute. In these are used either fuse shells, cast-iron ring shells, steel shrapnels, or case shots; number of balls in shrapnel, 180. Employ a little arithmetic: 40 times a minute, 180 balls in each shell fired, gives 7200 balls poured in among human beings in one minute, to do the work of death. We have not the time to take up in detail the exhibit of the United States Government. But in that may be found modern instruments of war equally effective, equally destructive and death-dealing. By a new automatic rifle, seven shots a second can be fired, 420 shots a minute.

These exhibits of the implements of war have been brought to the Exposition at a great outlay of force and great expense. If the only object were to demonstrate what has been accomplished in perfecting these implements and in increasing their destructiveness or to extend their sale and use to the other nations of the world, it would have been better to have left them at home. But if any single person shall have received from viewing them a keener sense of the horrors of war, or, better still, a conviction that the time has come when all wars should cease and some better way be substituted for settling national disputes, it will be a gain to humanity.

This Peace Congress, consisting of thoughtful representatives of different nationalities, will at least find in this grandest exhibit of the enginery of modern warfare a new motive to definite and practical action. Its members have long read the histories of battles and of wars with a profounder sense of their meaning than even the authors of history themselves have felt. And *having come* to this Columbian Celebration with a deep sense of the responsibility resting upon them, in view of its opportunity of reaching the whole civilized world, the members of this Congress will, I trust, go beyond the domain of mere argument and take the first steps towards the establishment of an International Tribunal.]

THE CHAIRMAN: The organization of a permanent International Court of Arbitration, its Advantages, Constitution, Powers, Limitations, Proceedings, Location, etc., is the next subject to be taken up.

A draft of a plan for such a court prepared by the Hon. William Allen Butler, Hon. Dorman B. Eaton and Mr.

Cephas Brainerd, of New York, has been sent to the Congress. But before it is laid before us, an explanatory paper accompanying it will be read by Hon. Robert Treat Paine of Boston.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF ARBITRATION.

Pursuant to a request of the American Peace Society and acting under its appointment as members of its Board of Honorary Counselors, we have carefully considered the advisability of submitting to the Congress of Arbitration and Peace to be held at the World's Columbian Exposition a plan for an International Tribunal of Arbitration.

That the peaceful solution of controversies between nations by arbitration is to be sought in the interest of mankind by all available means, is an idea firmly established in the minds and consciences of intelligent men. Many leading jurists and publicists have made most valuable contributions to the literature of International Law, in proposals and plans looking to the establishment of an International Tribunal or Court of Justice, whose scope and jurisdiction should embrace all controversies arising between nations, so as to give a day in Court to any aggrieved Power and to secure a final determination in the interest alike of justice and of peace.

Among the many valuable contributions which have been made to the discussion of this important subject, dealing more or less in detail with the proposed constitution and methods of an International Tribunal of Arbitration, the following are conspicuous:— Proposed Treaty of Arbitration approved by the International American Conference; Draft outlines of Rules of Arbitration, by David Dudley Field; Draft outlines of Rules, by Leone Levi; *Memoire*, by M. H. William Blymyer; Suggestions, by Dr. M. R. Levenson; the recent Essay by Sir Edmund Hornby.

It would be comparatively an easy task in the light and with the aid of what has already been accomplished and formulated by the eminent writers whose labors we have referred to above, to present a plan for the formation of such tribunals as they have respectively had in mind and endeavored to aid in establishing. The arrival at practical results in the attainment of the object they have had in view must, however, necessarily be a work of time, possibly of successive steps, more or less tentative in their character, leading by a wise and cautious method to such a demonstration of their efficiency and wisdom, commanding the respect and confidence of mankind, as to compel their adoption by the different governments of the world.

Arbitration as a means of determining disputes between individuals, corporations, communities or nations, must have its basis in the consent of the parties who agree to be bound by this mode of adjudication. Experience has shown that where arbitration has been made a substitute for litigation, its power for

good has resulted more from the voluntary compact of parties than from any aid derived from statute or municipal law, and any effective results depend mainly upon the adherence of the parties to the terms of the arbitration.

We are impressed with the conviction that any successful and adequate method of establishing a permanent Court of Arbitration of an international character must be the result of special treaty stipulations between nations willing to adopt such a judicial method of settling their disputes. After considering the various plans looking to the establishment of such a tribunal and making some progress in the endeavor to formulate a project upon similar lines, we have concluded that the better course is to confine ourselves to the recommendation of a plan for the creation, by means of treaty stipulations between consenting nations, of a joint commission to be composed of the representatives of the high contracting parties, and clothed with ample authority to adopt and formulate a binding and permanent plan for a Tribunal or Court of Arbitration, to be so constituted and organized as to form an International Court of supreme and final jurisdiction for the hearing and determination of all questions and controversies arising between the contracting States. This Court should have power to make its own rules of procedure and practice; to appoint its secretary or other assistants; to select its place of meetings, and have central official action and to hold itself in readiness to act either as a whole body *in banc* or in smaller sections, as occasion should require, in view of the nature and importance of the questions which, on due notice, according to the course and practice of the Court as declared in its rules, should come before it at the instance of any of the contracting nations.

This recommendation, if favorably received by the Congress at Chicago and referred to a committee so constituted as to include in its members the publicists who have been most active in initiating and promoting international arbitration would, it seems to us, be likely to lead to some definite and practical results, and we respectfully submit that the formation of such a committee would be an important step in advance in the interests of peace and the avoidance of the causes of war. The Committee whose appointment we suggest, if accredited by the Chicago Peace Congress, would perpetuate the influence of that body and would have the great advantage of an actual and historic connection with it; and we cannot but think that the continuance of such a representative organization, with power to increase its numbers and fill vacancies, would be a means of aiding and enforcing public opinion and of availing of all opportunities which may offer for advancing the important objects committed to its care.

Respectfully submitted.

WM. ALLEN BUTLER,
DORMAN B. EATON,
CEPHAS BRAINERD.

NEW YORK, July 19, 1893.

The draft of a plan for the organization of an International Tribunal of Arbitration was then read by James Wood of Mount Kisco, N. Y., as follows :

PLAN FOR AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF ARBITRATION.

The undersigned, named by the American Peace Society as "Honorary Counsel," received through its secretary a letter requesting them to prepare a draft plan for the organization and constitution of an International Tribunal of Arbitration.

The undersigned submit, by way of suggestion, the annexed rules, while also submitting the views which they consider controlling upon the general subject.

It seemed best to place the rules in the form of a *project* of a treaty, to be so drawn as to enable any nation, not an original signatory, to accede to and become a party to the same at any time after its execution by the powers which may at the outset concur in it.

This general scheme has received ample discussion in the various peace societies, and in societies having for their object the improvement or codification of international law, in text-books, and in various periodicals in this country and in Europe, beginning at a very early date; notably represented by the publication of the American Peace Society, in 1840, of a series of essays on "A Congress of Nations." There is quite a general familiarity, it is believed, with the views which have already been presented on one side or the other, of the topics involved in this debate. Of course it is desirable that public discussions should proceed, even if no permanent tribunal is ever established, for such discussions tend to increase the pressure of public opinion the world over, in favor of the peaceful adjustment of international differences by the course of arbitration.

The undersigned feel that great progress in this direction has already been made. A late publication on the subject by M. Passy, Paris, 1892, embraces a list of fifty-eight special arbitrations resorted to by amicable agreement since 1794. No doubt, the results obtained by this method of adjusting disputes have been such as to increase very largely the disposition on the part of statesmen to resort to it.

The recent International American Conference adopted the scheme of a treaty, though not without some dissent as to the general plan, as well as respects the details, notably represented by very able addresses by Mr. Romero, of Mexico, and Mr. Varus, of Chile; the views of the latter, adverse to the practicability of the plan for the establishment of a permanent tribunal, are well worthy of careful consideration.

The undersigned have examined the numerous plans which have heretofore been published, the suggestions contained in the recent treatises on international law, and manuscript rules prepared by Mr. David Dudley Field, of New York.

No attempt is made to present rules originated by the honorary counsel, but rather to adapt those heretofore proposed to their own ideas of suitability for the permanent rules which might be embraced in a general treaty.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WM. ALLEN BUTLER,
CEPHAS BRAINERD.

July 19, 1893.

PROPOSED RULES.

In order to maintain peace between the high contracting parties, they agree as follows :

First. If any cause of complaint arise between any of the nations parties hereto, the one aggrieved shall give formal notice thereof to the other, specifying in detail the cause of complaint, and the redress which it seeks.

Second. The nation which receives from another notice of any cause of complaint, shall, within one month thereafter, give a full and explicit answer thereto.

Third. If the nation complaining and the nation complained of do not otherwise, within the two months after such answer, agree between themselves, they shall each appoint three members of a Joint Commission, who shall confer together, discuss the differences, endeavor to reconcile them, and within one month after their appointment shall report the result to the nations appointing them respectively.

Fourth. If the joint commissioners fail to agree, or the nations appointing them fail to ratify their acts, those nations shall, within twelve months after the appointment of the Joint Commission, give notice of such failure to the other parties to this treaty, and the cause of complaint shall be referred to the Tribunal of Arbitration, instituted as follows :

1. Each signatory nation shall, within one month after the ratification of this treaty, transmit to the other signatory nations the names of four persons as fit to serve on such tribunal.

2. From the list of such persons the nations at any time in controversy shall alternately and as speedily as possible select one after another until seven are selected, which seven shall constitute the tribunal for the hearing and decision of that controversy. Notice of each selection shall immediately be given to the permanent secretary, who shall at once notify the person so selected.

3. The tribunal thus constituted shall, by writing, signed by the members or a majority of them, appoint a time and place of meeting and give notice thereof through the permanent secretary to the parties in controversy; and at such time and place, or at other times and places to which an adjournment may be had, it shall hear the parties and decide between them, and such decision shall be final and conclusive.

4. If either of these parties fail to signify its selection of names from the lists within one month after a request from the other to do so, the other may select for it; and if any of the persons selected to constitute the tribunal shall die or fail from any cause to serve, the vacancy shall be filled by the nation which originally named the person whose place is to be filled.

Fifth. Each of the parties to this treaty binds itself to unite, as herein prescribed, in forming a Tribunal of Arbitration for all cases in controversy between any of them not adjusted by a Joint Commission, as hereinbefore provided, except that such arbitration shall not extend to any question respecting the independence or sovereignty of a nation, or its equality with other nations, or its form of government, or its internal affairs.

1. The Tribunal of Arbitration shall consist of seven members, and shall be constituted in the manner provided in the foregoing fourth rule; but it may, if the nations in controversy so agree, consist of less than seven persons, and in that case the members of the tribunal shall be selected jointly from the whole list of persons named by the signatory nations. Each nation claiming a distinct interest in the question at issue shall have the right to appoint one additional arbitrator on its own behalf.

2. When the tribunal shall consist of several arbitrators, a majority of the whole number may act, notwithstanding the absence or withdrawal of the minority. In such case the majority shall continue in the performance of their duties until they shall have reached a final determination of the questions submitted for their consideration.

3. The decision of a majority of the whole number of arbitrators shall be final, both on the main and incidental issues, unless it shall have been expressly provided by the nations in controversy that unanimity is essential.

4. The expenses of an arbitration proceeding, including the compensation of the arbitrators, shall be paid in equal proportions by the nations that are parties thereto, except as provided in subdivision 6 of this article; but expenses of either party in the preparation and prosecution of its case shall be defrayed by it individually.

5. Only by the mutual consent of all the signatory nations may the provisions of these articles be disregarded and courts of arbitration appointed under different arrangements.

6. A permanent secretary shall be appointed by agreement between the signatory nations, whose office shall be at Berne, Switzerland, where the records of the tribunal shall be preserved. The permanent secretary shall have power to appoint two assistant secretaries and such other assistants as may be required for the performance of the duties incident to the proceedings of the tribunal.

The salary of the permanent secretary, assistant secretaries and other persons connected with his office shall be paid by the signatory nations, out of a fund to be provided for that purpose, to which each of such nations shall contribute in a proportion corresponding to the population of the several nations.

7. Upon the reference of any controversy to the tribunal and after the selection of the arbitrators to constitute the tribunal for the hearing of such controversy, it shall fix the time within which the case, counter-case, reply, evidence and arguments of the respective parties shall be submitted to it, and shall make rules regulating the proceedings under which that controversy shall be heard.

8. The tribunal, as first constituted for the determination of a controversy, may establish general rules for practice and proceeding before all tribunals assembled for the hearing of any controversy submitted under the provisions of these articles, which rules may from time to time be amended or changed by any subsequent tribunal; and all such rules shall, immediately upon their adoption, be notified to the various signatory powers.

Sixth. If any of the parties to this treaty shall begin hostilities against another party without having first exhausted the means of reconciliation herein provided for, or shall fail to comply with the decisions of the Tribunal of Arbitration within one month after receiving notice of the decision, the chief executive of every other nation, party hereto, shall issue a proclamation declaring hostilities or failure to be an infraction of this treaty, and at the end of thirty days thereafter the ports of the nations from which the proclamation proceeds shall be closed against the offending or defaulting nation, except upon condition that all vessels and goods coming from or belonging to any of its citizens shall, as a condition, be subjected to double the duties to which they would otherwise have been subjected. But the exclusion may be at any time revoked by another proclamation of like authority, issued at the request of the offending nation, declaring its readiness to comply with this treaty in its letter and spirit.

Seventh. A conference of representatives of the nations, parties to this treaty, shall be held every alternate year, beginning on the first of January, at the capital of each in rotation, and in the order of the signatures to this treaty, for the purpose of discussing the provisions of the treaty and desired amendment thereof, averting war, facilitating intercourse and preserving peace.

CHAIRMAN NIXON: The next subject upon the program is a paper prepared by Sir Edmund Hornby, of London, England, on the "Advantages of a Permanent Court and the Difficulty of creating Tribunals for Special Cases."

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD: Sir Edmund Hornby's paper is here, but he has recently sent me a letter requesting that it be not read, on account of certain allusions made in it to the Behring Sea case now pending. I propose in place of it to read a short paper by Edward Everett Hale of Boston, from whom I know you will all be glad to hear. The paper is entitled "The High Court of Nations."

THE HIGH COURT OF NATIONS.

THE TIME HAS COME FOR A PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL.

It can be formed, and should be formed between two, three or more of the Great Powers. In its constitution, arrangements should be made providing for the extension of the range of its authority.

A precise type of the step thus to be taken is found in the history of simple communities. In the simple phrase of our own country, when two neighbors disagree, in a simple form of society,—far away perhaps from other men,—they settle their question by what the fine native language calls, "leaving it out to men." They make a board of arbitration.

But as civilized government extends itself, permanent Tribunals—called Courts of Justice—are founded, to determine such questions. It is manifestly better to have such courts, permanently arranged, than to create a new court for every difficulty.

So in the affairs of States with each other. The United States is a nation, which owes its name to the establishment of a permanent Tribunal between thirteen States, independent until they were thus united. For one hundred years the United States has been a great Peace Society, because it created in 1789 a Permanent Tribunal, which has power to determine all questions which arise between the States united. The number of these States has increased from thirteen to forty-four. There has been one contest of arms among them, resulting from the misfortune, that one question was left among them, which this Permanent Tribunal might not decide.

This Tribunal acts under a grant of power from the people of the United States, which extends "to all controversies between two or more States." Under this grant it has adjudged difficult questions of boundary, of citizenship and of mutual complaint, precisely as an ordinary court decides questions between different men.

The success which has attended the great arbitrations between nations in the last century is very gratifying.

But in each such case a new Tribunal has to be established, unknown, and without reputation till it has earned it. So soon as it earns its reputation, it is dissolved. If a new difficulty arises, a new Tribunal must be created. Each Tribunal has to create its own methods, and, indeed, to determine its own standards and laws.

A permanent Tribunal—always in existence—and meeting frequently even if no question come before it, would win for itself new respect by every decision, and would in time form an authoritative system of International Law.

It would be that such a Tribunal should be made of at least some of the most distinguished jurists of the world. To hold a seat on it would be one of the highest honors to be conferred upon man. As the number of States which relied upon it increased it could be enlarged. A court of thirteen members would seem the proper number for six Powers confederated together.

It would be natural that each nation would name two members from its own citizens. It would be well, that by mutual agreement of the nations, one member at least should be a jurist, from one of the smaller States, who might be supposed to be quite impartial in decisions between nations.

This Tribunal should be appointed, by mutual consent, without reference to any existing question. Arrangements should be made that the appointments should be for a long series of years, that large and honorable compensation should be made for the service rendered by the judges, and that every distinction possible should be conferred upon their meetings. It would be well to appoint two or three marshals or other officers to make the business arrangements for their meetings, and a sufficient staff of reporters of decisions and other secretaries would be, of course, appointed by the High Contracting Powers.

Such a court would *exist*, before any case was brought before it. It would hold regular sessions, twice or three times a year. If not occupied in questions arising between nations, it would from time to time publish its opinions on subjects of International Law, which have been more or less discussed among the publicists.

It would *exist*. And in time, some question would arise which the Powers would withdraw from diplomatic discussion and submit to it.

This question would be discussed by counsel, exactly as the questions of the Seal Fishery have been discussed this year in Paris.

The court would decide such a question and determine it. For no Power now existing would venture to protest against such a

decision. It would carry with it the common sense and the sense of honor of each of the nations engaged. The arbitrament of war would not and could not be invoked, after such a decision.

The High Magistrates who would be named to serve on such a Tribunal would be the men who had received the highest honors of their States. In other times the United States would have named John Quincy Adams, after his presidency, to such a post. In our times or in future times, it would be a place by which a retiring President would be honored. Chancellors and Chief Justices would be named to it, as a place of fit preferment, after an honorable career in the home service of the nations to which they belonged.

And in all the studies of law, of social order, of jurisprudence and of administration to the highest honor to be conferred on the citizen who had best served his country would be his appointment, for a series of years, as a member of The High Tribunal of Mankind.

MRS. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD, of Washington, D. C., was introduced and read the following paper :

MR. PRESIDENT — This question is not new to our peace friends, either in America or in Europe, the problem having been under discussion by our societies in this country for at least twenty years ; and expressions of opinion upon it, with ways and means for its accomplishment, have been exchanged with our European peace friends for at least as many years.

The efforts of the friends of peace on both sides of the Atlantic for the suppression of the African slave trade away back in the fifties, in which Wendell Phillips, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Parker Pillsbury, Lucretia Mott, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and other brave spirits, figured with such eminent distinction ; and their coadjutors in Great Britain and France, followed by our treaties with Great Britain for this purpose of June 7, 1862, the Annex of April 7, 1862, the Additional Treaty of July 1, 1863, proclaimed March 5, 1864, the second Additional Treaty of June 3, 1870, with the Annex, containing instructions to seize and search any American or British vessel engaged in, or suspected of being engaged in, the African slave trade, together with the final treaty or general act between the United States of America, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, the Independent States of the Congo, the French Republic, Great Britain, Italy, The Netherlands, Persia, Portugal, Russia, Sweden and Norway, the Ottoman Empire and Zanzibar, including forty-one nationalities banded together for this purpose ; and the restriction of the importation into and sale of, within a certain defined zone of the African Continent, of firearms, ammunition and spirituous liquors, a question agitated so extensively by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and which was finally ratified at Washington by Benjamin Harrison, April 2, 1892, with Jas. G. Blaine as Secretary ;

The Treaty of Washington, relative to Claims, Fisheries, Navigation of the St. Lawrence, etc., American lumber on the river St. John and boundaries ; referred to a High Joint Commission to settle the difficulties between the United States and Great Britain after our late civil war, resulting finally in what was known as the Alabama Claims Commission, the merits of which were determined by that memorable conference at Geneva, in which our friend and colleague Alfred H. Love played so important a part, by

first suggesting the Commission to settle the difficulties, and then with other members of the Peace Society, when the settlement had been agreed upon, sending to the Commission in commemoration of that occasion that noble Peace Plow, which still graces that immortal chamber where this Commission held its sessions in the ancient Hotel de Ville;

The Convention at Brussels, of the United States with forty other American and European States, July 5, 1890, for the formation of an International Union, for the publication of customs tariffs, including in its deliberations forty-one nationalities who were able to agree upon these questions;

The Convention between the United States and Belgium, Brazil, Italy, Portugal, Servia, Spain and the Swiss Confederation, for the international exchange of Official Documents, Scientific and Literary Publications, concluded at Brussels March 15, 1886, and proclaimed January 15, 1889, by Grover Cleveland, with T. F. Bayard, Secretary of State, show conclusively that aggregations of nations, or of their representatives, may be joined together for mutual benefit, or for the repression of mutual ills, antagonistic to the best interests of humanity, as was especially shown by the recent Convention at Brussels for the suppression of the cholera, and the promise of a prompt signal to each government of any sign of the dread disease within its borders; as well as the results finally attained by the persistent efforts of the friends of any important reform.

The Sherman resolution of June 5, 1888, not fully enacted into law, on account of a technicality, until February 14, 1890, was the outcome of an agitation begun in the first instance by the Universal Peace Union and the National Arbitration League, and was, in 1887, drafted by the author of this paper, and introduced into the Senate of the United States April 9, 1888, read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows :

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to institute negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain and France for the purpose of creating a permanent tribunal for international arbitration, whereby all difficulties, differences and disputes between the United States and these nations may be promptly, peaceably and amicably settled.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray the necessary expenses of such negotiations.

This bill had for its backing a memorial from the Society of Friends, which was presented by Dr. Barnabas C. Hobbs and Dr. J. C. Thomas, who were granted a hearing before the Senate Committee, and later memorials from all the yearly meetings of Friends in this country and Europe; of the ministers of the Congregational Church of Boston, led by the Rev. Henry J. Patrick and Willis D. Leland; a communication from W. R. Cremer, M. P., of London, containing the opinions of many English peers and bishops upon the question of International Arbitration, together with an English Committee bearing a petition signed by two hundred and thirty-three members of the British Parliament; petitions from the citizens of Massachusetts, led by Oliver Ames and others; petitions from the citizens of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, California and Kansas; together with resolutions from the General Court of Massachusetts. To this was added by the writer of this

paper, a memorial sent from France, containing the names of one hundred and twelve members of the Chamber of Deputies, headed by Fredric Passy, Yves Guyot, M. Barodet, etc., and sixteen members of the French Senate, with the resolutions of five French Societies of Peace. There was also a petition with the names of Alfred Love, Amando Deyo, Levi K. Joslin, Daniel Hill, David Dudley Field, Belva A. Lockwood, Elias Underhill, Andrew Carnegie, Abram S. Hewitt, Charles A. Peabody, Dorman B. Eaton, and Morris K. Jessup; and the latter named personages had a hearing on this question before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I have thus particularized about this bill because it was an educational campaign by these three great nations—the United States, Great Britain and France for a higher civilization than the rule of brute force that had so largely heretofore governed the nations of the world—and it culminated in what has since been known as the Sherman resolution, February 14, 1890, which reads thus :

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That the President be, and is hereby requested to invite, from time to time, as fit occasion may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has, or may have, diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, may be referred to arbitration, and be peaceably adjusted by such means.

This joint resolution, secured with so much effort, and comprehending such vast possibilities, remained for a time comparatively inert on the statute book, President Harrison declaring that the resolutions conferred no new powers on the President, until succeeding legislation, which also had its origin in the efforts of the Universal Peace Union, and the National Arbitration League, galvanized it into life.

This was the assembling of the ever immortal Pan-American Congress, called in the first instance by James G. Blaine, during the Garfield administration; the invitation being recalled by his successor, Secretary Frelinghuysen, after Garfield's death, and revived later and enacted into law by the bill of Jas. B. McCreary, of Kentucky, then Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the House. This also was the outcome of the efforts of the National Arbitration League, of Washington, in which Jacob M. Troth, Isaac Gibson, Frederick Stanton, Dr. T. M. Bland, and other noted peace men worked, together with the writer of this paper, and who first proposed what then seemed to be chimerical, but now eminently practical, a convention of the nations of the world. The compromise for the Convention of the American Nations was finally reluctantly accepted, and this Congress was held in the winter of 1889 and 1890.

The resolutions of this memorable Congress, which will always form a page in history, and which continued in session for six months, is familiar to you all; and especially so is that grand enunciation which marked the close of their deliberations, running thus: "Hereafter it shall be a feature of the American Public Law, that all differences between American States shall be settled by arbitration."

This Congress closed its sessions April 18, 1890, but the invitations to the European nations were not sent out until 1892.

This invitation was promptly accepted by Switzerland, between whom and the United States there had long existed an accepted, but unratified treaty. This treaty of permanent arbitration with the United States was ratified by the Danish Parliament on the 21st of last November, through the efforts of our indefatigable peace friend, and President of the International Peace Bureau, Fredrik Bajer. It has been accepted by the English House of Commons through the indomitable efforts of our Parliamentary friend W. R. Cremer, who backed his resolution of acceptance with a petition representing 2,000,000 Englishmen. Our little unpleasantness with Great Britain about the seals in Behring Sea, just now so amicably settled, may have retarded for a time the ratification of this treaty, but it is sure to come.

The earnest efforts of our dear dead friend, Chas. Lemonnier in Paris, and my own efforts in Washington to secure a permanent treaty of arbitration between the United States and France, in 1888, 1889 and 1890 (may not be known to many of you), in which each nation waited in its dignity for the party of the other part to make the overtures, while the technicality in the Sherman resolution made it inoperative, but the record of that effort is in the archives of the State Department at Washington, and in Paris.

It was during these negotiations that Chas. Lemonnier prepared an elaborate treatise on an International Arbitration Court; the greatest ambition of his long and useful life, and also a draft of the proposed treaty. During those negotiations the Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, preferred the form of the 21st Article of our Treaty with Mexico, known in history as the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, while Mr. Lemonnier and the French people preferred the form adopted between the United States and Switzerland.

All of the members of the Parliamentary conference at Berne, on the 31st of August, 1892, pledged themselves that when they returned to their homes, and to their respective parliaments, that they would introduce resolutions asking their governments to accept this invitation, and adopt the treaty. Pursuant to this pledge, it has been called up and discussed in the Italian Parliament by our earnest friend Marquis Pandolphi; in the Spanish Senate by our long time friend Arturo de Marcoartu; in the Lowlands by M. Rahusen, etc.

These are some of the preparations for the International Arbitration Court. Our Spanish friend St. Charles de Armstrong, in an elaborate treatise formulated a plan for this court in 1890, Fredric Passy in 1891, the Marquis Pandolphi in 1892, and Hodgson Pratt, who has made this question almost a life study, during the same year, also our Italian friend, S. Angelo Mazzoleni and more recently Sir Edmond Hornby. The first work however of this sort to which our attention was brought, was that of Leoni Levy, of Switzerland, in 1887-8. The question of an International Arbitration Court, by which all difficulties between nations may be settled juridically, without recourse to arms, has absorbed the attention of the most learned jurists of our time.

THE USES OF THIS COURT.

1. It will save thousands of human lives.
2. It will save money and property ; the destruction of records that can not be replaced.
3. It will save the sacking of towns, the murder of innocent women and children, the burning of valuable libraries, churches and schools.
4. It will save national and international hates and animosities that last through generations, and which often survive the remembrance of their cause.
5. It will lead to the disbandment of armies that are now eating up the bread and sustenance of the common people, and will restore them to wealth, happiness and thrift.
6. It will do away with judicial murders that have for so many centuries deluged the countries of the world in blood, to gratify the whim or caprice of perhaps a few arrogant rulers, while civilization, Christianity and humanity turn backward to gather up again the ravelled threads of the progress of the past.

Not prepared yet for peace, do you say? The law has been elaborated, the framework built, and already has our own Government of the United States entered into three hundred distinct treaties of arbitration, running through all of the various difficulties that may arise between nations, without resort to war. Already has the wisdom of our rulers avoided three hundred wars by arbitration. The numbers amount to more than an exception. It has become a rule. The times, civilization, Christianity, humanity, demand it. The times are ripe for it.

The permanent International Arbitration Court will be as great an improvement on the temporary arbitration court, which is every now and then being established to meet individual cases, as the circuit or district court in our country is above the common justice's court. It will be the product of thought, of experience, of

elaboration. It will be composed of broad minded, cultured men, well read in international law, and above the petty intrigues, passions, or national bias, and in the interest of the largest justice and humanity; and one in which the rights of the smallest nation whose interests are considered will be as secure as those of the largest and most powerful. The element of brute force will be done away with as a motive power, and every foreigner in every country will feel the protecting influence of this court.

What more opportune time than this, at the gathering of this great Congress, represented by the finest legal minds of the world, to pass this resolution, and to set in motion the wheels of a movement that shall revolutionize all that has hitherto been considered as constituting the grandeur of a nation, viz., her ability to make conquests; and to establish the principle that hereafter peace and arbitration shall rule the destinies of the world.

It will be the reform of all reforms; the highest law and the highest court in the universe, evolved, and elaborated during the continuance of this great Exposition, controlled and directed as it is by such men as are directing this Exposition Auxiliary, consisting of the Congresses of the world; and such women as Mrs. Bertha M. Palmer, Myra Bradwell and others; and in which is displayed all of the God-like propensities of man, viz., that which constitutes his thought, life, his skill, his mechanism, his science, his art, his humanity.

It will be a crowning outcome for this international gathering, that will make it memorable for centuries to come, and the whole universe will be the better for our having lived in it.

WASHINGTON, D.C., Aug. 1, 1893.

CHAIRMAN NIXON: The Chair will call Dr. Leverson to the platform to lead in the discussion.

DR. LEVERSON: Ladies and Gentlemen—Fifty years ago we were a handful, and almost alone in our efforts for Peace. At that time I would have hailed with delight the propositions contained in the able report presented to us. But I think we have gone beyond this stage, since we need now to be satisfied with the propositions there laid down. The difficulties in the way of securing peace by tribunals, which are to be established from time to time as occasion requires, are well set forth by Sir Edmond Hornby, and in his views upon the subject I heartily concur. As long ago as 1888 a plan was submitted by me to the London Peace Society, and, without any request or notice on my part, submitted to the Peace Congress which held its sittings at Rome in 1889. It is an illustration of the regrettable matter in our Congresses, that that Congress is not connected with its successor; that the action of that Congress of Rome was not permanently before all other Congresses which have acted in this matter since.

The plan which I submitted to the judges of the Lombard Peace Society provided for the permanent tribunal which the scheme presented to us to-day contemplates. I may add that Sir Edmond Hornby's plan and mine differ only in matters of detail.

My idea was, that while the nations adhering to this plan should not be required to nominate each more than one member of the tribunal, they might, if they pleased, appoint one for every ten million inhabitants; but I provided in this that they should pay the expenses of all the judges they appointed. Sometimes judges were not to be dependent on the State which appointed them for their salaries, but a common fund was to be provided. Now, of the judges to be appointed by each nation — and this, I think, is a very important consideration in any permanent tribunal — not more than one-third should be citizens of the nation appointing them. The tribunal as contemplated by me would be numerous enough to be divided into sections, and each section would have a sitting in one of the nations party to the treaty.

Now I will not trouble you with the details, but provision was made in the scheme which I propounded for the decision of questions not merely between parties to the treaty according to this tribunal, but even between those who were not parties to the treaty. Under any other plan which I have seen such a difficulty as lately arose between France and Siam would have been without the jurisdiction of the tribunal unless both France and Siam had been parties to the treaties appointing such tribunals. Under the plan which the Lombard Congress approved any nation could make appeal to that tribunal.

There are other provisions, the details of which I will not trouble you with. I merely say they agree in the main with those of Sir Edmond Hornby, and those wishing to examine them will find the whole plan in a pamphlet entitled, "War Clouds and How to Disperse Them," which I have recently published. The time has already arrived for adjournment; but I wish to make a few remarks upon another subject.

I consider that a vast debt is due to the Society of Friends; and, though not a part of this Society, I recognize that we owe a deep debt of gratitude to them the whole world over. I think the Peace Movement has now attained the position that we may require our Congress, as our representatives, to take action of a more positive character than has yet been done. This is a question in which the mothers, the wives, the sisters and the daughters of America can exert an influence, and they will be listened to with respect. I do earnestly appeal to the women of America to take action in impressing upon their husbands, their sons and their brothers the point that Members of Congress should be made to feel the duty resting upon them of passing a law *instructing*, not merely putting it as the paper does, *requesting*, but demanding of the President that he shall open up negotiations with all the

nations of the world ; not with one, two, or three ; but with all of them, inviting them to enter into such a treaty.

Let me ask you to think for a moment of the injustice which soils our name in our conduct with China and Chile. Had it not been that both these nations were powerless they would have what used to be called "causes of war" against us. We have done unjustly, and at present there is no redress for them. Had a tribunal of this kind been in existence our name would not have been sullied as it now is. I hope that the recommendations of the committee with regard to the appointment of a committee for the further consideration of this matter will be adopted. I also earnestly hope that steps will be taken to hand down the proceedings of the Congress held to-day here in Chicago, and which I hope will prove one of the most memorable which has ever been held. It is important to hand down these transactions to the succeeding Congresses so that the next Congress may not have to take up the effort anew and do over again the good work which has been done, and that we may bring our efforts to bear upon the single point and urge upon our Representatives and our Senators to adopt this method of preventing wars for the future.

The Congress held in Rome, to which I referred, urged upon the members of the parliaments of Europe to introduce into the houses of which they were members bills for carrying out this particular plan which I presented to them, or such a better plan as they might think fit.

But it gave its unqualified approval to the plan, and I think it will be found — I do not say this from any love of authorship — but I believe that of all the plans which have yet been presented you will find that which I presented in 1888 to be the most practicable.

We must get at work upon our Representatives and our Senators ; we have an educational work to do in this matter. Now all our educational institutions are at fault. This was well illustrated by one of our speakers, I think it was General Howard. The system of instruction puts before the children the glories of war, and the young men are constantly being trained in the habits of war. In all the histories the glories of war are presented, and in no history of which I know anything which has been put into the hands of children have the horrors of war been displayed except in those marvellous reminiscences of Erckman-Chatrian, which I do not hesitate to recommend you to distribute as widely as you can among the people. The horrors of war, and not its false glories, are the things which ought to be brought before the minds of our children in the schools and colleges of to-day. We have a large educational reform to make, and the men we have got to reform first of all are the presidents and managers of our universities, our colleges and our normal schools.

CHAIRMAN NIXON: In further discussion of this subject the Chair will call upon Mr. James Wood.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Peace Congress — It is impossible to magnify the importance of the proposition which is now before the Congress. I am prepared heartily to vote for its adoption, and I believe the weight of such action is increased by frank discussion. I think that when a proposition of this kind comes before such a Congress, and is adopted in bulk, without much consideration, it fails to carry with it the weight that a free discussion followed by approval would give.

I do not venture to set my judgment up against the opinion of the gentlemen who have prepared this very able plan now before the Congress; but I humbly venture to suggest that there are some points of detail in their scheme that might be improved. In the first clause of the fourth section, after the "Whereas," you will observe that they propose that each nation becoming a party to this agreement shall name four persons as fit to serve on such a tribunal. In the next clause of this section they propose that the nations in controversy select from the names of those offered seven persons who shall determine the question in dispute.

But to my mind there is a serious objection to this arrangement, because it is possible that all of the representatives, or the persons chosen as members of this court between nations, shall be citizens of one country.

Now we all know that nations, as individuals, have their leanings, their bias. Equally honest and candid persons view a question from different standpoints. So nations not only honestly view questions differently, but they have their leanings and preferences, which might have an influence over their judgment. Now it is not often in the history of arbitration that there is exhibited a mind so noble and so grand as that of Justice Harlan, of the Supreme Court of the United States, sitting in the Behring Sea arbitration and voting against the points most strenuously contended for by the government which he represents. There are but few men like Judge Harlan in the world, and while we may be thankful for the part that he took in this great arbitration, it is rather more than we can hope for that there will be many Judge Harlans on similar courts in the future.

Let us illustrate. Let us suppose that at the present time questions are in dispute between two countries, one of which is France. And let us suppose that the machinery of this method was put into practical operation, and France, as its turn came to choose the members of this great court, chooses three-fourths of its representatives from Russia. There is no nation in Europe that would submit to the decision of that court. Let us suppose, on the other hand, that a nation of the Triple Alliance of Europe was in dispute and it should choose, as it doubtless would choose if it were Austria, all of its four members of this court from either Germany

or Italy. Would France or Russia submit? By placing so large a number as four from each nation upon the list you incur a danger, you place a rock that will surely retard the progress of the ship on its first voyage. So long as it is possible by this method that all the members chosen by a nation in a dispute come from one country you make it impossible for the decision of the court to be final.

Another thing. They propose that nations in dispute shall choose from this large number of members, in rotation, one and then the other making a choice. What would this result in? Just so soon as the first steps for creating such a court were entered upon there would be a broad canvass of all the names that had been presented. We know men would be looked into; their decisions, their past acts, the bent of their minds on public questions and points of international law. It would result in the packing of that court by the selection of men, more often by their nationality, as I have already suggested, who by their arguments, their decisions and their public declarations, are known to favor the nation selecting them. That would be a dangerous thing. This canvass would undoubtedly be carried on in a very diplomatic way, but it would, notwithstanding, be a canvass with a view of packing the court before it ever entered upon its deliberations.

Another thing. They say that this court shall be composed of seven individuals chosen in the manner indicated. Who shall have the first choice? The party having the first choice will have four members. The first choice will be determined by lot, and so finally all the questions in dispute might be decided by lot, because the party having the first choice would have a majority of the members of the tribunal. This would certainly be a very objectionable method of constituting the court.

Now these are three objections that strike me as very serious. I think myself it would be very much better to have the number of names, from which the selection should be made, so small that it would be impossible that all the members chosen by one of the parties in dispute should be of one nationality.

In the second place, I think it would be advisable that the court be constituted in another method altogether, than by the parties in dispute making the selection, because there is a danger of judges being selected because of their views in favor of one or the other party. There should be a permanent court, so that the parties to the controversy should have no voice in selecting the persons who should decide the questions that had arisen between them.

Now, as I have said before, I simply venture to make these suggestions in the way of an improvement on the proposition that has been laid before the Congress. If there be any weight in the points I have raised I hope they may have your careful consideration. If they are not entitled to it, I beg your pardon for occupying the time in their presentation.

THE SECRETARY : It was not the intention to have this plan voted upon either in bulk or part by part. The purpose of the American Peace Society, when it began early last winter to have this plan prepared, was simply to bring the subject prominently before the Congress, to secure its further study, and, if possible, to have the Congress adopt some method by which such a court may, in the near future, be called into existence by the governments of the world. It is not proposed to ask this Congress to vote its approval in bulk, or even to vote upon it at all. Such a vote would be only the expression of the opinion of this Congress, and would be of very little worth, as we are not experts on judicial subjects.

CHAIRMAN NIXON : The Chair will now call upon the Rev. Dr. Darby of England.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — There are two things on which we may congratulate ourselves this morning : first, for this discussion which, in my judgment, is the most important discussion of the whole Congress. We began this session, too, with the recognition of another triumph of arbitration in the form in which it has been applied hitherto, namely, by the appointment of temporary tribunals. Not only do we gratefully recognize what has been done, but we congratulate the nations interested on the result of that great triumph of arbitration procedure.

Then I think we are deeply indebted to the American Peace Society for having had this matter brought before us in a very practical form. A great deal of our discussion necessarily cannot end in any direct result ; but this morning we are asked to come to some practical resolution.

Now in regard to the first point : This Behring Sea Arbitration adds another to that long list of cases given to us by Mrs. Lockwood this morning. Arbitration applied in the very imperfect manner in which it has been in the past has achieved very great results, and I venture to prophesy that this Behring Sea Arbitration will rank with that of the Alabama decision as one of the most important cases in the whole range of arbitration in this century.

Now, as has been abundantly shown to you this morning, the tribunals appointed for particular cases are imperfect, and we cannot expect arbitration in that form to succeed fully or accept it as the goal of our aspirations. So many reasons for this judgment have been given to you that I need not attempt to add others. There is the difficulty in the selection of arbitrators. All arbitrators, as we have been reminded, are not Judge Harlans, and all arbitrators that may be chosen may not be the most suitable for the adjudication of the particular cases. Many arbitrators are dependent upon specialists ; their technical knowledge of the particular dispute which has been put before them does not enable them to act independently. That is one defect. Then there are others. Courts appointed *ad hoc* have not the authority which a

permanent tribunal would have. Their decisions would not be accepted as precedents. There are other objections. Sir Edmond Hornby in the excellent essay, one of the best contributions to the discussion of the subject that I know of, to which reference has been already made, points out some of these difficulties. My own opinion is that he makes a little too much of them. You know there are two ways in which a great Federal constitution may come into existence; so I take a concrete instance. There is the British constitution which has gradually been established by precedent. It is not written. Our Common law is, as our late poet says, "broadened down from precedent to precedent." There is another way. Your United States constitution, which has been quoted this morning, was formed in a very different way. There were States already in existence which had revolted against the arbitrary rule of the mother country, and these States had a meeting and deliberately discussed a plan for freedom and the framing of a written constitution. They were able to do it because they were all seeking a common end, all moved by a common sentiment; so your United States constitution was deliberately formulated. So you see there are the two distinct ways of framing a constitution. Now, sir, these decisions of these two great Tribunals of arbitration, and of every particular court which has been formed, are contributions to the formation of the great body of precedents. I do not, therefore, take altogether the same view of the matter that Sir Edmond Hornby does. I think that the Geneva arbitration, having to settle its rules, and to establish certain points for its guidance, has helped to form the great body of international law which will be the guide of the future for courts of arbitration.

We have had a number of schemes presented to us. The scheme of the Pan-American Conference, that of David Dudley Field, the one of London, of the various Peace Societies, national and international. All of these are simply contributions to the discussion of the subject. Now, Mr. President, we want to take some practical action. What can we do here this morning toward the realization of a Permanent International Tribunal? There was a sentiment expressed just now which I noticed was applauded by a good many of you, that the power to do this is in your hands. Is it, ladies and gentlemen? Well, let us rise in a body, then, and say it shall be done instantly. The world has suffered long enough because of the old method of settling international disputes. If we have poor laws, it is the fault of the people. If we desire to change these poor laws, let us use the power. Oh, but we have not got it. It is true generally, that public opinion rules the world. It is not true that any particular assembly can rule the world, unless it can put its finger on the spring of public opinion, and move that as it will. And then we are not in the position of the people who met to discuss the United

States Constitution. We are a body of earnest people representing a much larger body of people of the same convictions, and having the same aims and purposes, but we are still in the minority, and we have not public opinion at our control. In this particular case, the power is not in our hands. But I tell you what is in our hands; it *is* true that we have the ability to initiate this movement and that is what we are asked to do. We may discuss here *ad infinitum* the methods of procedure, but what will the government of Great Britain, the Emperor William of Germany, the Czar of Russia and the powers of the older nations of the world say to us?

Now, it seems to me the proposal which has been put before us is one eminently practical and one which is likely to lead to the best results. We are asked to take an important step, and I hope this Congress will not separate before it has adopted the proposal to appoint the committee to which reference has been made and that this Congress, therefore, may initiate this movement which within a short time is to result in a permanent tribunal. It is not we who have that power; it is the governments of the world. So I refer you to what was said in that admirable report which I shall ask the Chair to give me, because it expresses the question before the meeting. The plan submitted to you this morning, which you are asked to refer to a committee, aims at establishing a permanent court by means of treaty stipulations between consenting nations, a very different thing from a popular vote here. The tribunal is to be realized by means of treaty stipulations between the consenting nations. What we want is a joint commission to be composed of the representatives of the high contracting parties and clothed with ample authority to adopt and formulate a binding permanent plan for a tribunal or court of arbitration. These men will be for us. They will have all these points before them. They will take up all these schemes, including the one presented to this body, and they will examine them, and then of course will come to their own conclusion. Then the recommendation contains something about what this Congress is to do. They say, if favorably received by the Congress, this plan shall be referred to a committee, so constituted as to include in its membership publicists who have been most active in negotiating and promoting international arbitration. Now that is what we have to do, to appoint that committee, or to take steps to have them appointed, and that committee will take further steps and in this way will do a very much larger work than anything that can be accomplished in one single Congress or in a series of Congresses. This committee will take steps to have the whole matter brought before the governments of the world and to induce them to take the steps necessary for the establishment of a tribunal which shall create its own constitution and set about its work in its own way.

Sir Edmond Hornby has written me a number of suggestions of a very practical kind which I think will come within the scope of what we desire. He says :

“ Now is the time for the Peace societies, collectively, to memorialize the crowned heads in the form of an address exclusively confined to them, the same to each in substance but rendered suitable and applicable to the circumstances of each case.” Of course its preparation will demand care ; above all it must not dictate but persuade, and persuade on grounds that cannot be disputed or ignored. The address should be presented personally to the sovereigns by a small and influential deputation. If you appoint the committee that you are asked to do before this Congress adjourns, that committee will do its very best work and in its own way. You want as influential a committee, therefore, as you can possibly have, to influence the nations to say that by treaty stipulations they will take the necessary steps for the formation of a permanent court. It may seem to that committee that it is part of their duty to memorialize the crowned heads.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have tried to keep to one practical point before the Congress. I could say a great deal about arbitration. I think I could discuss a little some of the questions that have been put before us. But I am anxious first of all not to trespass too long on your time and then that the discussion of this morning may speedily reach some actual conclusions and substantial results. If this is done, the bright future for arbitration which has been expressed here this morning will soon dawn, and this Congress at Chicago will have done such work that it shall occupy a permanent place in the history of the peace movement. Believe me, the time will soon come when this terrible condition of militarism which prevails all over Europe to-day shall give way to a condition of industrialism. The time will come when this great permanent court will enable nations to pass from the chaotic condition of things which prevails to-day to a condition of order. And I think by taking action to-day we shall take our place amongst the instruments which shall be used to bring in the better time.

CHAIRMAN NIXON : In further continuation of the discussion the chairman will call upon Mr. Robert Treat Paine, of Boston.

MR. PAINE : Mr. Chairman—It gives me pleasure to follow with a few words the excellent address we have just listened to by the gentleman from England.

We have welcomed at this Peace Congress delegates from many other nations with that open hearted welcome which you in Chicago have given to the representatives of all the nations on earth ; but I suppose I may say that with just a little bit heartier affection we turn to the old mother country of England. We have

listened with peculiar pleasure to the cordial acceptance which England by the mouth of the secretary of the Peace Society of that country has given to this scheme which in this Congress has been thrown before you and which, through one of these "crowned heads" who is our chairman here to-day representing the press of the country, we have thrown before the world.

I was delighted to hear the criticism of Mr. Wood. It is not supposed that this plan is perfect: it will be improved by many suggestions in this country and abroad; but the thing we have aimed to do is to fasten the attention of the world, by that power which Chicago at this moment has in the eyes of the world, upon the importance of securing in some way, some scheme or method, that shall substitute, permanently, arbitration for war.

Now it happens that just at the moment of this session of our Peace Congress England and America have achieved another great triumph in the way of arbitration. I want to add just one word, and to have the pleasure of congratulating you, and through you our country on this successful arbitration, even though they say the decision is against America. We rejoice to have had an arbitrator, Judge Harlan, a member of our United States Supreme Court, of such absolute independence, that when he had heard the case argued, he could decide what he believed to be right. When he comes home the welcome that he will receive will be warmer and heartier, because he has illustrated American independence, than if he had thought it his duty to support the side of his own country.

Now is it possible for us by any flight of imagination to conceive the condition that would have sprung up between this country, the citizens of this great country and the other important English-speaking nations, if instead of by arbitration we had settled that controversy over a matter up in the remote northern seas by the ancient method? The lady who spoke to us yesterday about pursuing botany amongst the savage tribes of California admitted with a certain degree of lovely candor that she admired the Indians "more than anything else except botany." She was loyal to her first love. There may be persons who would prefer a fur seal to anything else on earth; and if there are, them I shall offend. But to all others is it conceivable that this country should have plunged itself not only into war, which settles nothing except who is the stronger, but into something infinitely worse than war, into that feeling of embittered hate which lasts, I was going to say, forever! That we should have done that, that the whole English-speaking race all around the world should have done that for the fur seals sounds like the conduct of mad men.

If this meeting can present a scheme for a permanent High Court that shall keep the peace among nations, it may do more than even my friend Dr. Darby suggested, it may give a momentum to this movement that shall entitle us to say that we have

achieved a great success. We approach these questions here in America with just a bit more freedom than they do in the old world. Some of the delegates who come here tell us that while the Peace Congresses at Paris and Rome and Berne are all very interesting there are some supremely important questions which the delegates do not dare to discuss.

Now the one burning question in Europe is how France and Germany can be brought into peaceful relations, in the settlement of that feud growing out of the conquest of Alsace and Lorraine. I want to say simply this: no feeling exists here which represses the expression of sentiments regarding this or any great movement, and we rejoice to be at perfect liberty to speak out here in America with freedom, and to regard criticism with smiles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this audience to one great fact, and I am going to ask with candor, whether after I shall have mentioned it, any person here would claim that he duly appreciated that fact. We are meeting here on the shore of this superb sheet of water, the great lakes, a series of the greatest lakes in the world. How many in this audience know that before most of us were born, by an arrangement between England and the United States, this whole series of lakes were permanently dedicated to peace; and that it is contrary to the solemn treaty between those two great nations to have ships of war upon the lakes, from one end to the other. That little treaty, of a few lines, made so long ago, has changed the whole face of this North American continent, because without it we should have had navies, and then there would have been conflicts, and standing armies. What may grow out of collisions between two sensitive and powerful nations, let imagination dream. We came within an ace of having that treaty repealed in one of the periods of excitement, during our civil war, but by the providence of God it was saved. While we came up to the very edge of abolishing the treaty by the actual giving of a notice, yet that notice was withdrawn and the treaty remains, and these waters are dedicated to-day and we hope forever to peace. (Applause.)

There is one other point that it occurs to me to refer to in reply to our English friends. We do not wish to boast, but yet I suppose it is true that it is almost impossible for a Chicagoan just now not to feel proud of the grandeur of the city and nation to which he belongs. Having created something which no city ever has done before, and which apparently — at any rate, we coming from Boston think — no city will ever do again, entitles this great Exposition to be called, what it has been well called, a Declaration of Independence in American art. Now I am going to speak with entire freedom, even if my friend, Dr. Darby, when he goes home, should say that we allowed the American eagle to scream. We do think, we of Boston, that this Exposition is the noblest creation which has ever come at one time from the hand of man.

There is one other thing in which America has achieved something that never has been done before in the world. Our United States Supreme Court, with nine men meeting in Washington and sitting in their robes of peace and giving decisions between great nations, between New York and Pennsylvania, perhaps, or between Illinois and Indiana, or between any States, and those decisions bowed to by the populations of the contending States—nations in population, power and wealth—without a question—never before had the world seen that sight until it was the outgrowth of American independence, and the world may well consider whether such an example cannot be followed.

MRS. LOCKWOOD: Yes, or between Canada and the United States, in the case of the sealing ships.

MR. PAINE: Perhaps so. That idea is what we wish to have extended from the United States over the world.

The scheme of a Supreme Court has been made nearly perfect here in the constitution of the United States, which, as Dr. Darby has said, has grown up, under the care of skilful men, with guarded limitations, to protect the rights of the smaller States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask, as a concluding word, that without passing a formal resolution it may be taken as the sense of this meeting that the Executive Committee of this Peace Congress be charged with the duty of creating a committee of jurists and friends of peace who will continue this work, and, without undertaking to force upon the world any definite scheme, will do all that wise men can devise to secure the judgment of the world upon the best scheme in its various details for a High Court of Arbitration among nations, and who will do what they deem best to present it most effectively to the public and to the press, which is one of our "crowned heads;" and to the other crowned heads of the world, including Mr. Cleveland and the President of the French Republic, to the end that the movement which we have urged to-day may before too long be successful.

DR. DARBY: I may not have another opportunity to say what I feel I am in duty bound to say, and that is that I heartily concur with my friend Mr. Paine in his eulogy of the great American nation. It is my first visit to America. I have seen your shores, and as I did for the first time, I thought you did not present a very grand front to us, but as we came west that first impression has been supplanted by another and a higher estimation. True, I have seen but very little of your great institutions. I have come in contact with your citizens and I have seen a portion of your great stretch of territory, and I am bound to say with all heartiness and sincerity "the half has not been told."

Now I rise to express my concurrence with Mr. Paine, and also to ask him to modify his idea of what we dare to do on the other side of the water. There is a great deal of truth in what he says. It has been abundantly manifested in some of the utterances

made in our congresses, but it is in part explained when I say that in certain localities some things are lawful which are not expedient. And now I wish to pay a tribute of friendship to one who has represented very nobly your American independence, particularly on the other side of the water; and if he were here I think he would say the same thing about what we dare to do there. It was our great English poet who said, "I dare to do all that may become a man;" and there are men on the other side of the water. One of the noblest of your citizens, one of the sincerest and most tender, hearty and genial, sweet-spirited and lofty-tempered men that ever I met I had the pleasure of standing side by side with on the platform of the Congress at Rome, when a question which was very unpopular was in debate and was simply cried down; and it is due to the memory of the late secretary of the American Peace Society, my beloved friend the Rev. R. B. Howard, to say that the last speech he ever made, under the most intense suffering, when his feet were already half way across the river, when his head and heart were catching something of the glory which fell upon him a little later, the last speech my noble friend ever made was made under such conditions, and illustrated the fact that you in the great American Republic do grow, pardon me if I use an Americanism, do grow men who dare to say the thing that is in them and say it in a manly way.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD: I take it for granted that it is the judgment of the Congress that the Business Committee appointed two or three days ago shall feel authorized to arrange for the appointment of the Committee recommended by the gentlemen from New York in their report. This we will try to do as early as we can.

A VOICE: Can any one make suggestions to the Committee?

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD: The Committee will be delighted to receive suggestions from any one.

Adjourned.

SEVENTH SESSION.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17TH, 3 P. M.

Bishop Samuel Fallows was in the chair when the Congress reassembled at 3 o'clock in the Hall of Washington.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Congress will now please come to order. I have great pleasure in introducing to the audience the Hon. William E. Curtis, late Chief of the Bureau of American Republics, Washington, D. C., who will speak to us on the Pan-American Congress. (Applause.)

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen —

THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN CONGRESS.

Fronting the Plaza Bolivar, in the City of Caracas, stands an old building with adobe walls four feet thick, and grated windows like a prison. To the right, across the Plaza, is the ancient cathedral; to the left the Casa Amarilla, or Yellow House, in which the President of Venezuela resides. In the centre, mounted on a rearing horse, is a bronze effigy of Simon Bolivar, the Liberator of South America and the founder of five Republics, of which one still bears his name. Across the street, in the other direction, is the Palacio Federal, the capital of the Republic, where the Congress sits, and official ceremonies, of which our Spanish American neighbors are so fond, are held. The structure of which I speak is now the City Hall, the Palacio Municipal, the seat of the Municipal Government, but it was the residence of the Governor when the country was a colony of Spain.

Here, on the fifth of July, 1811, three hundred and nineteen years after the discovery of the New World, the first of the Spanish American colonies declared its independence, and the leader in the movement a few years before had been the lover of an Empress, the famous Catherine the Great of Russia. There had been considerable disturbance before, murmurs of discontent and violent remonstrance, just as the people of Boston threw overboard the tea; but this was the first time that the citizens of Spanish America assembled publicly, and in a solemn, formal manner declared their emancipation from the exactions and the edicts of the King; and here began that political hurricane which spread over the continent and lasted sixteen years, until all the Spanish colonies had repudiated their allegiance and were transformed into

Sovereign and Independent Nations, with Constitutions modeled upon that of the United States.

The original Declaration of Independence, faded and frayed until many of its lines are illegible, hangs upon the wall; and at the opposite end of the apartment is a large painting intended to commemorate the scene. The foremost figure and the most conspicuous, is that of a slender man with striking features and soft, gray hair worn in a queue. He is Francisco Miranda, the first leader of the revolution for independence in South America, a native of Venezuela, and the most romantic character in the history of that Republic. His family were of the oldest and wealthiest of the colonial nobility and, according to the custom of their caste, the son was sent to Europe to be educated. In 1778, when Lafayette returned to France to secure funds and reinforcements, young Miranda, who happened to be in Paris, was the first to volunteer, and, sailing for Boston, served as a Lieutenant-Colonel on the staff of Washington until the end of the war. Becoming inspired with an ambition to be the Washington of South America, in 1783 Miranda sailed for Venezuela with a party of adventurers, issued pronunciamientos, and raised the standard of liberty, but the time was not yet ripe. There was no response from the people, and, being easily overcome, the young patriot was sent into exile, while his associates were either shot or hung. Two years later he was found at St. Petersburg, one of the most conspicuous figures at the most brilliant court of Europe, and the acknowledged lover of that remarkable woman, the Cleopatra of modern times.

Miranda was a man of graceful manners and alluring traits. He was a poet, a musician and a wit; but behind the gay abandon of a courtier he concealed the craft of a diplomatist; and while he entertained the Empress and her retinue, he was endeavoring to enlist their aid for the invasion and liberation of Venezuela. Either losing the favor of his fickle patron or his own patience, Miranda left Russia to participate in the French Revolution and become a General of Division. He was held responsible for the loss of the battle of Neerwiden, tried for treason and banished. Disheartened, impoverished and ignored, he spent two friendless years in the slums of London, where he was discovered and rescued by a young countryman and former neighbor, named Simon Bolivar, who was making a tour of Europe.

In the meantime the people of Venezuela had learned the meaning and the value of liberty, and when Bonaparte assumed the throne of Spain, declined to acknowledge his authority. The Spanish Governor was compelled to abdicate and leave the country, and a self-appointed committee of citizens administered the Government until Bolivar arrived from England with Miranda, who was proclaimed General-in-Chief of the army and President of the new Republic.

A few months after occurred the awful earthquake by which the city of Caracas was destroyed, and many of the men who had been foremost in the Revolution were buried, with thousands of others, in the ruins. The priests, who were always royalists, pronounced the calamity a visitation of God and the just judgment of Heaven upon the unpardonable crime of rebellion against the King, the Lord's anointed. This great disaster demoralized the patriots and dispersed their army. Miranda was arrested, transported to Spain and imprisoned in a dungeon at Gibraltar, where he died, and the body of a man who was acknowledged to be one of the most brilliant courtiers on either hemisphere, and had been caressed by an Empress, was cast into the sea.

Suspended upon the wall beside the declaration of Venezuelan independence in the old council chamber is usually found another relic, quite as precious and even more interesting to the student of American history because of its age and associations, which is now exhibited with other historical relics in the Venezuela Pavilion at the Exposition. When Francisco Pizarro started for Cadiz for the conquest of Peru, he was presented with a silken banner which bore the escutcheon of Aragon and Castile, and is said to have been embroidered by the fair hands of Queen Isabella. Above the armored dragons of Pizarro, in the cruel butchery of the innocent and harmless Incas, whose only crime was a feeble defence of their lives and hearthstones, this dainty banner was borne, and, with the cross of Christ crucified that they carried in the other hand, it represented the system of civilization which the Spaniards brought from the old world to the new. Under its dainty folds more crime was committed and more innocent blood was shed than an eternity of perdition can adequately punish, and, although the work and gift of a pure woman, it was the emblem of murder, robbery, rapine and devastation, carried to a degree that the world elsewhere has never seen.

When Bolivar emancipated Peru from the yoke of the Spaniards this banner hung in the cathedral at Lima, over the rusty bones of Pizarro, and its captors divided it in two parts. One half was given to the Liberator, who brought it to Caracas, and the other half to Sucre, one of the noblest heroes of the Revolution, who presented it to the national museum at his native city of Bogota, where it still remains.

Like Miranda, Simon Bolivar was a native of Caracas, of noble lineage, and possessed of great wealth. In 1802, he left his home in company with a tutor, to make a tour of the world and complete his education. He went to Cuba first, then Mexico, and sailed thence for Europe, where he spent several years in Spain, France, Italy, Egypt and the Holy Land. Upon his return he visited the United States, and spent a day at Mt. Vernon, where, placing his hands reverently upon the coffin of Washington, he made a solemn vow to devote his life to the liberation of his

country. Reaching his native land he became active in the revolutionary propaganda. In 1810, he was denounced for sedition and fled to Europe, where he met Miranda and returned with him to Caracas.

Fifteen years later, after a struggle to which that of our revolutionary fathers offered no comparison, he sat in the capital of Bogota, the founder of five Republics:—Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia, the last having been named in his honor. At that time the States were consolidated under a single Government with Bolivar as President.

It was then, in 1825, when the whole continent was emancipated from Spanish tyranny, and the "human freedom league" existed from the St. Lawrence to the Straits of Magellan, that he issued invitations to the independent nations of this hemisphere to join in a Conference at Panama for the purpose of considering measures to preserve the peace and promote the prosperity of the new Republics. John Quincy Adams was President of the United States and Henry Clay was Secretary of State. Both were deeply moved with sympathy for the young Republic and profoundly impressed with the importance of the Conference, and the duty of the United States to participate and promote its success.

Henry Clay had rendered great service to Bolivar and his compatriots, and had been their ablest and most determined champion in the United States. He had demanded with his characteristic impetuosity that the sympathy for them should not exhaust itself in useless words, but advocated armed assistance to the colonists in their struggle against Spain. His speeches on this question are the most brilliant productions of his genius, and he strove to impress Congress and his countrymen with the importance of the consolidation, or at least the coalition of America, against what was known as the Holy Alliance in Europe. But the pro-slavery party held a majority in Congress and saw peril to their "divine institution" in the Conference at Panama.

The first act of Simon Bolivar when he inherited the property of his parents was to emancipate the family servants; and when the people of Peru presented him with a purse containing one million dollars, as a testimonial of their appreciation of his services to them, he expended the money in purchasing the freedom of several thousand slaves. In a message to the Congress of Colombia Bolivar had said:

"There must be no caste upon this continent. There is no blood less noble than other blood. All is the same in the sight of God. All are heroes who enter the battalions of liberty, and all are equally entitled to the just recompense of valor, of honor, of intelligence, of virtue and of sacrifice."

Such doctrine was very offensive to the statesmen who dictated our legislation in 1825, and Bolivar had invited to participate in the Conference, the black Republic of Hayti,—a name that

had an ominous sound in the United States for more than thirty years. If our politicians could have blotted one page from the book of history, it would have been that which told the story of the successful negro revolution in Hayti. It was a warning that made them shudder, and they saw in the Conference at Panama a menace to the "repose" of the South.

The fervid patriotism of Mr. Clay, and the rugged puritanism of Mr. Adams were aroused to a determination to permit no opposition in this country to impede the progress of democratic sovereignty on this continent. In his message to Congress Mr. Adams said:

"It may be that in the lapse of many centuries no other opportunity so favorable will be presented to the United States to subserve the benevolent purpose of Divine Providence, to dispense the promised blessings of the Redeemer of mankind, to promote the prevalence in future ages of peace on earth and good will to man, as will now be placed in their power by participating in the deliberations of this Conference. For now, at this propitious moment, the new-born nations of this hemisphere, assembling by their representatives at the Isthmus between diplomatic intercourse with other nations and with us, ask, in this great exigency for our advice upon those very fundamental maxims which we, from our cradle, at first proclaimed and partially succeeded to introduce into the code of National law."

Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay gained a formal victory over the slave-holders, in securing the authority of Congress to send Delegates to the Panama Conference, but the opposition practically secured its purpose by delaying action, for when the Ambassadors from the United States reached the Isthmus, the Conference had been in session for several weeks, and had been compelled to adjourn, with its work unfinished, because of an outbreak of yellow fever.

Such was the genesis of the movement to establish good fellowship among the American Republics. Nearly three quarters of a century has elapsed, but the immortal idea survived, and what Bolivar proposed was left for Blaine to accomplish, and on the second of October, 1889, there assembled at Washington, the representatives of eighteen independent nations, with a population of one hundred and ten millions of people, to exchange sympathies and to establish brotherhood. They met as friends and neighbors to promote their mutual and individual interests, and the perpetual preservation of peace. The world has never witnessed a more impressive spectacle, and it was a fitting method of commemorating the progress of industry, intelligence and commerce during the four hundred years of American civilization that are just closing.

The Conference was a deliberative body. It met to confer and recommend; to exchange ideas and opinions. There were no

quarrels to settle, no injuries to repair ; but every Delegate had a common purpose, and that purpose a common good. It was fitting that this assemblage, the first union of the sisterhood of American Republics, should meet upon the soil of the greatest of nations, at the home of the oldest of the family group. The delegates came as representatives of Governments founded upon the same ideas that caused ours to exist, and when they met the last throne upon the hemisphere had fallen, and the last slave was free.

The Conference did much to remove the obstacles in the way of an increased trade, but it was merely a deliberative body, and could take no final action. Its powers were limited to the declaration of principles involving political and commercial relations between the eighteen Republics, and to the recommendation of legislative and diplomatic action to the several Governments. The delegates discussed at length and earnestly the topics they were called to consider, and referred them to Committees for closer investigation and reports. There was some difference of opinion, but much less than was anticipated, and with one or two exceptions the action of the Conference was unanimous.

The reports and recommendations have been submitted to the Congress of the United States for its approval, and several of them have already been ratified.

The great moral issue involved in the meeting was triumphantly carried through, and its force has been felt around the world. Seventeen American nations, for Chile refused, concur in the terms of their declaration :

“ Believing that war is the most cruel, the most fruitless, and the most dangerous expedient for the settlement of international differences ;

“ Recognizing that the growth of the moral principles which govern political societies has created an earnest desire in favor of the amicable adjustment of such differences ;

“ Animated by the realization of the great moral and material benefits that peace offers to mankind, and trusting that the existing conditions of the respective nations are especially propitious for the adoption of arbitration as a substitute for armed struggles ;

“ Convinced by reason of their friendly and cordial meeting in the present Conference, that the American Republics controlled alike by the principles, the duties and responsibilities of popular Government, and bound together by vast and increasing mutual interests, can, within the sphere of their own action, maintain the peace of the continent, and the good will of all its inhabitants ;

“ And considering it their duty to lend their assent to the lofty principles of peace which the most enlightened public sentiment of the world approves ;

"Do solemnly recommend all the Governments by which they are accredited to celebrate a uniform treaty of arbitration."

The treaty was prepared at once, and immediately after the adjournment of the Conference was signed by the representatives of eleven of the seventeen nations that declared in its favor. Two others have added their adherence during the present year. The Conference also solemnly declared that the principle of conquest shall never hereafter be recognized as admissible under American public law.

Second, that all cessions of territory made subsequent to the present declarations shall be absolutely void if made under threats of war or the presence of an armed force.

Third, that any nation from which such cessions shall have been exacted may always demand that the question of the validity of the cessions so made shall be submitted to arbitration.

And, then, finally, the following was adopted :

"That this Conference having recommended arbitration for the settlement of disputes among the Republics of America, begs leave to express the wish that controversies between them and the nations of Europe may be settled in the same friendly manner."

The scene that occurred in the Conference when the arbitration of war was solemnly forbidden, was one that will never be forgotten, and should be fastened in enduring colors to canvas. Although each Delegate, with the exception I have named, came from his country pledged and instructed to invoke the influence of the sister nations to secure perpetual peace upon this hemisphere, in the multitude of councils, in the rivalry of leaders, and in the earnestness and sometimes bitterness of debate over the meaning of terms and the framing of phrases, the sublime purpose of the Conference was very nearly lost. There was a scene of turmoil and confusion, angry words were thrown back and forth across the room, some Delegates were charged with insincerity, and others with offering to sacrifice the interests of eighteen nations to gratify their personal spite or jealousy.

Mr. Blaine sat in the chair, as restless and impatient as a caged lion. Although the presiding officer he was not a delegate and had no right to the floor. But he could speak through others, and calling Mr. Andrew Carnegie to the platform whispered a few words in his ear. The latter returned to his place, and at the first lull in the excited debate demanded recognition.

"Mr. President," said he, "I believe that this confusion and the differences among the Honorable Delegates are largely due to improper translations and a misconstruction of the meaning of some of the words in the text, and in order to give an opportunity to correct the misunderstanding, I move that this Conference take a recess of twenty minutes."

The motion was carried. Mr. Blaine left the chair and called

the angry disputants into an adjoining room. In half an hour he returned his face glowing with satisfaction, and a paper in his hand. He sent the Vice-President to the chair, and taking the floor, by the unanimous consent of the Delegates, he exclaimed in a ringing, triumphant voice :

“Mr. President, I am very happy to announce that any vital difference upon any question connected with the scheme of arbitration, which an hour ago might have been feared, is, I hope, entirely removed, and the resolutions of the Honorable gentlemen have been simply changed from being in perpetuity to running at even dates with the Treaty of Arbitration ; so that they stand and fall together ; they are born together, and they will die together. But we shall hope that the lives of both will be perpetual.”

The first applause that had been heard during the entire session of the Conference interrupted the proceedings then.

Mr. Blaine read the articles in succession, and they were translated one by one by Mr. Zagarra, the delegate from Peru. Then came the vote, and it was unanimous,—the Delegates from Chile having withdrawn.

Thus, sir, did seventeen nations of this hemisphere pledge themselves that wars upon the American continent shall be no more, and that the angel of Peace shall preside at the court of Arbitration, to which all cause of difference shall be appealed. There is no doubt, sir, that the influence of this act will be effective in promoting domestic peace in these countries which is too often disturbed by political aspirants and defeated candidates for office ; but the internal revolutions are growing less and less frequent as the people become educated and learn self-control. Great hopes are resting upon the results of the Conference, and its conclusions will be accepted and enforced, for to-day the sentiments of all the sister nations are none other than those expressed by Simon Bolivar in the sublime toast, uttered more than sixty years ago :

“To the Liberty, Fraternity and Prosperity of the American Republics. May they endure as long as the North star stands as the axis of the Universe, and the cross, for eighteen hundred years the symbol of peace and good will to men, hangs starlit in the Southern sky.”

THE SECRETARY : We are very grateful to Mr. Curtis. He is in charge of a very important section of the World's Fair, and it has been with great difficulty that he has been able to come ; and yet I am sure I voice the sentiments of the entire audience when I say that we are very grateful to him for coming and reading this very instructive paper. (Applause.) Mr. Curtis is, to our great regret, compelled to leave on account of his work in the Exposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now have the pleasure of listening to Sr. Don Nicanor Bolet Peraza, of Venezuela. (Applause.)

SR. PERAZA: Gentlemen—If in speaking on the results of the Pan-American Congress, whose sessions were held in Washington in 1890, I were obliged to confine myself merely to the practical results obtained, my work would be indeed short, and perhaps unworthy of occupying your attention. But fortunately I am now addressing a public accustomed to examine the progress of ideas in all the stages of development, an audience more apt to understand me than the public at large, which, as a rule, is only capable of appreciating those things which have taken some definite, tangible shape, that are usually termed *results*.

If it were the object of this Peace Congress to demonstrate the practical results of the great labor and noble efforts tending to eliminate war from the earth, made by civilized humanity, and more especially by that part of it composing this body of philanthropists who now hold their Fifth International Congress within these walls, little in truth could it present to the world, for we all know that the most advanced nations are to-day preparing for war, and every day the moment appears closer at hand when they will fall upon one another, in order to satisfy some traditional feud or for purposes of territorial aggrandizement.

The results of the International American Conference of which I had the honor to be a member as representative of the Republic of Venezuela are not as yet palpable, but they can be appreciated by this Congress which has not undertaken the colossal work of changing the standard of the nations and the morals of its peoples in this respect without counting on time and the influences brought to bear by civilization as co-workers in this noble endeavor.

No one could hope after previously taking into account the difficulty of effecting a reform of such magnitude which encounters as its first obstacles the passions and instincts of humanity, no one could hope, I repeat, that the idea of substituting arbitration for the savage arbitrament of war, could spring forth triumphant out of the International American Conference; and nevertheless in that Assembly of American Republics, brought together for the first time since their creation, the greatest victory of Right over Might was won. Never since the foundation of human society have there been seen as were there seen seventeen nations unanimously condemn war as a final arbitrament of international controversies and solemnly agree to settle by arbitration all questions involving their rights. Nor was there ever seen before an assembly composed of weak nations and of powerful nations, presided over by the mightiest of them all, declare to the whole world that the so called Right of Conquest, established as such since the

most primitive period of human society, recognized by statesmen and philosophers and by advanced minds of all periods, was no right at all, but only a crime committed against the inevitable sovereignty of a people, which embraces not only its institutions but also the most remote square inch of its territorial domain.

These declarations, proclaimed by the International American Conference of 1890, complete the creed of Liberty and Independence professed by the American continent, which they began to propagate more than a century ago. Those declarations will be principles of the future American International Law though they may now appear as mere utopian conceits for the gratification of our youthful democracies, leaving out of consideration the fact that before they could be incorporated into all the codes it would first be necessary to eradicate the supposedly fundamental principle of creation by virtue of which the weakest must disappear to render possible the survival of the strongest and fittest, a principle not applicable universally, inasmuch as the eternal law of Progress which takes into account something else besides the law of self-preservation cannot abandon to the violence and greed of the stronger those races which are struggling to advance, nor those peoples which, though comparatively weak, labor also hopefully for the work of civilization.

It may perhaps be said that those principles to which the Conference gave its adhesion remain only as so much writing, that the treaties formulated on them have never been ratified by the Congresses of the Republics therein represented. But granting this to be the case it is also true that not one of those American Congresses has refused to accept those ideas nor has any single one disapproved those treaties. Circumstances entirely different from those provocative of an adverse opinion have deferred the definite consideration of the recommendations of the Conference, which have been greatly praised by the press of all the Republics and commented upon by advanced minds all over the world.

It may be observed in the history of the transformations of society and in the changes of its civilizations, how one man, possessed of some redeeming idea, has furnished new bases for morality, and how a group of philosophers has been sufficient to enlarge the aspirations of humanity, and furthermore, how one single people, this great American people, has solved the problem of practical democracy which is one of the greatest social and political victories ever obtained in the world.

Therefore, how can it be conceived that the regenerating ideas that were proclaimed by the International American Conference will be lost as are lost the dreams of fancy, without moving the minds or without piercing the consciences of men? No; that was no absurd dream of some deluded minds. It was the crystallized form of those aspirations and feelings entertained by the one hundred and twenty million beings who are nourished by Liberty

in the New World. It was the solemnly expressed conviction of the American Continent presided over by the most impulsive of its nations.

Before you, public spirited men of all countries, you, sublime optimists, for whom all effort born of faith in the perfectibility of the human race has the same value as a fact and the significance of one more step in advance, I do not hesitate to present as real and translucent facts those declarations of which I have spoken, which alone placed the International American Conference of Washington in the category of an historical event of the first magnitude.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now have the pleasure of introducing to the audience Dr. Fred. J. Tomkins, of Denver, Colorado, of London also,—I was going to say, of Germany also. Dr. Tomkins is an authorized attorney-at-law, empowered to practise before the British, American and German courts, and is well qualified to speak upon the topic now before us — the Reform of International Law.

THE SECRETARY: Dr. Tomkins has been for a long time a member of the Society for the Codification and Reform of International Law, which was established in Europe in 1873 as the result of a visit of Dr. Miles, at that time Secretary of the American Peace Society, and of Elihu Burritt.

DR. TOMKINS: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen — I have the honor to represent the Association for the Reform and Codification of International Law, which, I suppose most of you are aware, embraced in its membership the most distinguished judges and lawyers of the civilized countries of the world. The subject that I am to speak upon is

THE REFORM OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE INTERESTS OF PEACE.

Strictly speaking there can be no such a thing as International Law absolutely controlling nations and affording a legal sanction for the security of peace. The rules made between nations, or as it is expressed, *jus inter gentes*, are laws without a sanction and can not be enforced in the ordinary way. Whilst, however, one of the most ancient of the Greeks has said that "war was the father of all things," Greeks, Romans, Englishmen, Americans and Dutchmen, with that noble publicist Hugo Grotius and his disciples in the great school he founded, have not only felt that war must be avoided and limited; but that, as far as possible, all juridical and moral methods must be employed to temper and assuage its bitterness. Two questions may be asked: What has been done? What can be done?

Leagues have been entered into; Congresses have met, and Holy Alliances, convened under the solemn sanctions of religion have bound themselves; treaties have been made; and yet war threatens and is still hissing at our hearth-stones. Shall our efforts in the interests of humanity and of peace be relaxed? There is but one answer to this question: No. We make our appeal to the rising lawyers, statesmen and philanthropists of the world. The men of my generation are fast passing away, Miles of the United States and Joseph Sturge of Birmingham; Joseph Thompson of New York; Henry Brougham; Henry Richard and many noble men, lovers of freedom and peace on the continent of Europe, have borne their testimony and finished their life-work. It was well done, and as we place a garland on their graves, we say, now rest, rest in peace. In the name of freedom and peace we invite, we plead with our young men, our young lawyers, our young and rising statesmen to consecrate themselves to the noble and divine work of their fathers in devising methods for the perpetuation of peace and the prevention of war. My departed friend Mr. Henry Richard, M. P., had a strong desire to visit the United States and to plead this cause before you. Death intervened.

The subject allotted to me was originally intended for a most distinguished man whom we all honor and value as a scholar, an orator, a patriot and as one of the most thoughtful and active well wishers of our common humanity, Mr. David Dudley Field.

That our mission is not accomplished the following painful facts will prove. I stood, not long since, in one of the principal streets of this very city. I witnessed the procession of the Grand Army. A gentleman, standing in the door of one of your finest buildings, kindly invited me to view the procession from the doorstep that I might obtain a better view. "What do you," said he, "for I see that you are an Englishman, think of our soldiers?" "I think they march fairly well." "Yes, indeed," said my unknown friend, and added, "there is not one of them but would be glad to draw the sword and point the rifle against England." I replied — but I will only give my reply in private. Only a few days ago I attended a meeting in Denver and was honored by the speaker with a seat on the platform. The people were even then, before the late disturbance, suffering severely. Denver is a city inhabited by noble and worthy men and women of great intelligence. Two gentlemen of more than average ability addressed the meeting. They were, I believe, both of them clergymen. One, a very distinguished divine, frank, courteous and honest enough to tell us that he was regarded as a "Crank" in his own State. He had been a member of the conference on bimetalism. They were neither of them impassioned speakers, and one of them read slowly and deliberately all he said. My friend was hardest upon his own country. These were his words: "If your representative in Congress does not vote as you think he ought, upon

his return don't hang him, hanging is too good for him ; wrap him up in a garment saturated with oil of the Standard Oil Company and burn him to death." My friend, the other speaker, a very distinguished divine and president of a very important and ancient institution in this country, thought that a solution of the very grave and difficult question he was discussing might be attained by letting slip the dogs of war, decimating the blood-royal of England, dethroning Queen Victoria and thus bringing England to her knees. When these sentiments were applauded, he, a Christian gentleman, actually joined in the applause by clapping his hands, and by his gestures approving of these wicked and truculent remarks ; and yet these gentlemen were not vulgar and common men. Quite the reverse. These painful incidents must convince this audience that our work in the interests of peace and humanity is by no means yet accomplished. We must rebuke that cruel and barbarous spirit which upholds violence and war as a solution of State and national difficulties. When the time seen in vision comes, and come it will, when "truth shall spring from the earth and righteousness shall look down from Heaven," violence and war will be looked upon as the product of an age disgraced by barbarism, crime and murder. May we not hope and labor for the time when the race shall learn war no more, when a new race in a new epoch will look back with astonishment upon the follies and crimes of war? The time, I trust, will come when the statesmen of civilized nations will discover that nations and political institutions grow old, and that like the habitations of men they call for reconstruction, to be accomplished not by the battering ram of war, nor by the hungry, wolfish grasping of the more powerful ; but by the wisdom of the sage and by the councils of the elders of our world. Would such an adjustment of national differences dim the lustre of the German Fatherland? or wilt the lilies of France? or retard the progress of these United States? or the security of Austria? or the prosperity of any of the smaller States? As to Great Britain, her destiny is manifest. Why should war be the first and last resort of great nations? I need not describe its horrors. Look at the scenes painted by our great artists. Go through the long-drawn galleries of the Louvre in Paris. Read, if you can, the "Downfall" of Zola. The tumult, alas! is too soon hushed. Pale death soon hides away the unshrouded dead. Kind nature, that preserves the embryo blossom for a new spring, covers up and clothes with her vivid foliage the desolations that war has made.

Can we lawyers, jurists, suggest anything worthy of the consideration of thoughtful men? The science of war is now such, that we cannot look to the men whose thoughts and lives are expressed in the invention and preparation of every possible kind of engine and weapon of war. Those of us, who have been engaged, now for so many years in the study, in the practice and in the improvement of the law with an eye to its codification, have toiled

long, not ostentatiously nor in a spirit of dictation ; nor have we tried to force our views upon the rulers or the governments of the civilized world. Able, learned, thoughtful and distinguished men from all parts of the world have met, in different great cities of Europe, and as an Englishman I may be permitted to say that none have labored more zealously, more efficiently than American jurists. I might give a long list of names ; but it is enough to mention the names of David Dudley Field, his brother Mr. Justice Field, Judge Charles Peabody, Mr. Jay, Mr. Fred. Coudert and Governor and Professor Washburn. It has been my privilege and honor to report these proceedings in different parts of Europe for the *London Times* and for the *London Standard*. I am therefore able to say with some authority that our great leaders, having felt the difficulty of this subject, have touched very little and with great caution even on private international law, not to say public law or *jus inter gentes*. But if we have not talked, or even spoken with bated breath, my honored colleagues have been sought out by their governments and acted in the arduous controversies. Sir Travers Twiss, Sir Montague Bernard, Sir Richard Webster, Fred. Coudert and many others have helped to model the public law of the civilized world ; whilst my honored and beloved friends David Dudley Field and Sir Travers Twiss have now taken and will in the future take their place in the history and development of public law by the side of that great legislator for the nations of Europe, Hugo Grotius. History will do justice to these great men, as friends of the human race, and the great Dutch jurist and the classical school that he founded will be honored, as having first taught modern nations to assuage, as far as possible, the bitterness and cruelties of war.

We have now for long years discussed those private relations which affect status, procedure and the commercial affairs of the world. Sir Travers Twiss with his great and varied learning and his clear vision has presented for consideration and discussed many subjects that lie within the range of *jus inter gentes*, and I give expression to his views when I lay stress upon other methods that may be wisely used, and that are now submitted to your consideration. These are Arbitration, Mediation and an International Tribunal. I will concede at once that some of these methods may always succeed ; but just in proportion as the conscience of a nation becomes enlightened, in that same ratio will these means become powerful for good and instrumental in securing peace on earth. I well know that these means have no legal sanction ; but they have a moral one which, as the moral education of the world advances, must increase in vitality and power, until the kingdom and the laws of the Great Moral Supreme shall rule over all. Already Arbitration in matters of national dispute has prevented many wars. It has not, I know, been wholly satisfactory to England. It has been felt, in the highest quarters, that it has been a foregone conclusion to decide against England,

if possible, in every case; and that in one notable case England was robbed and spoiled.

My late colleague and friend Mr. Henry Richard, M. P., very carefully watched, examined and collated every case in which Great Britain had accepted Arbitration, and his matured views have been before the world in the papers read by him and published in the Reports of the Society for the "Reform and Codification of the Law." Mr. Richard is so fair, so calm, so luminous, so well informed that his papers deserve to be carefully read and patiently studied by all who feel the importance of this subject. The same or similar remarks apply to the writing of the Hon. David Dudley Field. The way in which this subject has been dealt with in some quarters seems to indicate that some men dread peace almost more than war. The Franco-German War, with its untold horrors and sufferings, has not made the warlike nations of Europe pause in their deadly preparations for war; but this terrible preparation must make all sane men feel that no method should be left untried to prevent the hurling of the thunderbolt of war from the red right hand of civilized nations. It is now our duty to declare, speaking in the interests of the great human family, that the time has arrived when *Public International Law* must be treated with the same method, and with the same juridical care and insight, that have been so well employed in the treatment of private International Law. Why not? The principles and rules that apply to status, property, marital relations and the commercial intercourse of mankind are important enough; but are not the lives of men, the happiness of families, the unbroken peace of the world, the limitation of warlike strife and its prevention of infinitely more importance?

There is another method that should be employed even when nations threatening hostilities will not submit to Arbitration: that method is *Mediation*. By that is meant the emphatic and formal expression of a carefully considered opinion, by an international tribunal, not of heated (partisan so called) statesmen, but of learned jurists, pledged to act according to the *jus inter gentes*, to their conscience; to this decision let there be added the formal, the solemn and impressive opinion that the dispute should not in view of the facts and circumstances be made a *casus belli*; but that in the interests of humanity the disputant parties should submit the matter in dispute to some court of Arbitration, and submit to its decision. "Nations," says Bishop Butler, "like individuals, sometimes become insane." Many wars have been rashly and wickedly entered into, in a time of national excitement and panic verging on national insanity. Under such circumstances war becomes a crime of the deepest dye. The voice and verdict of the mediation has no legal sanction, but when the voice of conscience is not stifled by selfishness; when the presence and power of the Moral Supreme is no longer doubted, then this moral sanction shall

make men pause ere they challenge the "awful wrinkles of the Almighty's brow:" angry nations shall hesitate before they rush in mad conflict upon the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler.

The final suggestion made is the constitution of an *International Court* for the purpose of Mediation and Arbitration. Not like the Congress of Vienna that created the Holy Alliance, which was a kind of armed *Concilium* of the leading nations of Europe; but a court in which the judges should be far removed from the confusion and ambition of party and political strife. Surely among the civilized nations of the world the materials might be found for the constitution of this august tribunal. They might have been found in ancient Rome. They could be found in these United States, in England, in Germany, and in the other great States of Europe. The decisions of such a tribunal might not be final, for the sanction would not be *legal*, which always implies force; but it would be a *moral* sanction, and no individual man, no nation however great and powerful, can defy with impunity the moral sanction of the Invisible. Before this all legal methods and all material weapons must sooner or later yield. We who adopt this method, unless we are sceptics, have a host mightier than that seen by the prophet arrayed on our side. When Newton, seeking for a calculus to solve the problems of the heavens invented his theory of Limits, the good Bishop Berkeley ridiculed the great philosopher and mathematician and laughed him to scorn. But Newton scaled the heavens and verified the solar system. All nature, all science, all modern discovery and aspirations, are aiming at the discovery of methods, larger, more beneficent and enduring than force, and the solution is found in the moral and the divine. This generation like the falling leaves of autumn shall soon pass away, but as every atom in the universe responds to the force of gravity, so every man and woman, and that political unit that we call the nation, is held as with a golden band to the throne of the Great Moral Supreme. Even our modern science in the growing realm of nature is teaching us that the great material forces are invisible and intangible. Science mediates the moral and the divine, and teaches us that under the eye of this Moral Supreme this moral sanction shall become infinitely more potent than any legal sanction, and as force and strength failed to conquer Prometheus, so war with all its mighty engines shall at last yield to the mightier force,—the moral and the divine.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now call upon the Rev. Philip S. Moxom, of Boston, to say a few words.

DR. MOXOM: I have listened, as you have, with profound interest to the papers this afternoon, and with not less interest to the last one than to the others, but some things in this one have stirred me, perhaps, more than they ought.

Day before yesterday I went into a building at the World's

Fair, and there, for the first time in thirty-one years, I saw the tattered colors under which the regiment to which I was attached, as a boy, marched on the sanguinary field of Fort Donaldson. A little distance from there I saw the colors which waved over the cavalry regiment to which I belonged for over two years. still a boy, but big enough to carry a sabre and march. I can hardly tell you the emotions that stirred my heart and filled my eyes with hot tears as I looked upon those flags. All the memories of that tremendous time came pouring into my mind and heart. I want to speak for the soldiers of America, and when any American tells Dr. Tomkins that the American soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic are willing to turn their sabre or muskets against any nation he talks sheer nonsense. (Applause.) It is the men who know nothing about war that are ready to go to war. (Applause.) It is the men who are like an artist that I knew who described himself in a great battle; he said, "I was there, I was there," and he began to look for himself in the front ranks. He could not find himself, but finally in the rear behind a huge tree, there he was. (Applause.) Those are the men who are so hot-mouthed for war, but the veterans know what war is, and they would be slow to enter into conflict with any nation.

I want to say another thing. I think I must know that college President to whom allusion was made. If he is the man I suspect I have known him a good many years. I knew him as a brave soldier, a good educator, a Christian gentleman, with an enormous propensity for jokes, and I suspect Dr. Tomkins and some others have been the victims of his jokes. Let me seriously say this, fellow delegates to this Congress: The really earnest and courageous people, not only in America, but in England and continental Europe, are not the people who want war. They have got a little beyond the beast stage. (Applause.)

I want to say a word about the general subject before us. Allusion was made to the fact that international law is not liked because, in a strict sense, it has no sanctions. What are the sanctions of law in the city of Chicago to-day? What are the real supports of the law that keeps this vast population in order? There is no military to speak of — is it the handful of police? It is the moral sentiment of the average man and woman. (Applause.) And the moral sentiment of the average man and woman all over Europe to-day would put the foot on war. (Applause.) As the result of long standing historic conditions it so happens that the diplomatic points of the various nations are the electric points which bring on war. The people do not want to fight and they do not talk of war. It is when the diplomats and the sovereigns get at logger-heads that they drive the people into war. Let a Court of International Arbitration be established. Once let treaties be framed and signed by the different nations of Christendom, and I believe that every great

battle-ship afloat on the blue waters about England or about America or any other maritime nation would become useless and cumbersome toys. (Applause.) Indeed, I am so much of an optimist as to prophesy that not one of the great battle-ships now in existence will ever be used in war. (Applause.)

To-day the world is reaching a crisis, and what we need more and more is to give expression to the vast unuttered sentiment among all the people with reference to this matter, and to press along all lines until we get an expression of this sentiment in the official action of the peoples, so that that which lies in the heart shall formulate itself in the stipulations of the treaty. The recent event in the House of Commons, of the passing unanimously of a resolution committing the British Government to a pacific policy, is the beginning of universal peace. Let the English-speaking people of this globe unite solidly for peace and arbitration and they will draw after them every other nationality on this planet. (Applause.) It is only a question of a few years till the red flags of war shall be furled, till the red dogs of war shall have forgotten how to bay, till our great war-ships shall be laid up in docks or harbors as curious spectacles of the savagery that has survived until the nineteenth century (applause), and the symbols of peace shall occupy all minds and hands.

LUCY CHASE, Worcester, Mass.: I want to make a suggestion with regard to the two anecdotes told by the distinguished speaker. On our sidewalks often are many foreign-born citizens who do not love the English as American people do. I do not believe a native American of two generations standing, and perhaps of one, would be willing to lend his hand to the overthrow of Queen Victoria, even though he knew that his arm alone was wanting to bring about that end.

SECRETARY TRUEBLOOD: It was the intention when Bishop Fallows took the chair that he should make a little opening address, but as Mr. Curtis had but little time to stay everything gave way to him, and I now have the pleasure of introducing Bishop Fallows.

BISHOP FALLOWS: I have made my speech through the eloquent lips of my good brother Moxom, for the reference of Dr. Tomkins in his address to the two persons mentioned stirred my soul pretty deeply. I agree with him that the person who stood on the sidewalk had perhaps never even shouldered a musket or drawn a sword.

With respect to my friend, the President alluded to, either he must have been joking, or else the language of Bishop Butler would apply to him as an individual who wanted to rush into war. He must have been the victim of emotional insanity.

Now just one word. I want to say this because the other evening, as this Peace Congress was holding its session, there were a great many men in the audience who were wearing the grand

army button, and these gentlemen said to me, "Why is it that this movement has not been made among the men who fought for and against the Union, that they may be induced to come into the great peace movement?" That set me to thinking. Why, I remember that when the man who led the armies of the Union, the great silent soldier who had made a triumphant march around the world, had come back having achieved the greatest victory he ever won, the victory over himself — I saw him in the greatest assembly of speakers and soldiers ever gathered together in this city turn down every wine glass that was before him, and not a single drop touched his lips. He went, sir, to that land which we all love with the tenderest of affection, and when the Commander-in-Chief of the British Army asked General Grant to be present at a review of the English troops, what did he say? "Please excuse me, I have had enough of armies — I don't want anything more of them." (Applause.) I heard the soldier who stood next in greatness to General Grant say at the close of the war, "I tell you, Bishop Fallows, I hate war," and he said it with a movement of the hand and of the foot that indicated a feeling of the heart. That was General Sherman's statement regarding war. If you were to gather together the soldiers of both armies you would find them almost to a man willing to wear this peace badge and do their utmost in the future to secure the cessation of all war. Why, let me say — I beg my able friend's pardon; he is in the house this afternoon, too; it is a wonderful coincidence — the commander who fired the first shot against the stars and stripes, that shot which was heard around the world, is here this afternoon in this room, the man who opened, by General Beauregard's orders, the war against the Union, and he is here pledged to the Prince of Peace, to do his utmost while God gives him power to speak or power to do to help bring about the time when swords shall be beaten into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, and the nations shall learn war no more. That is all, dear friends, I have to say.

In answer to repeated inquiries as to the person alluded to Bishop Fallows stated that it was Bishop Stevens, of South Carolina.

The audience then called out Bishop Stevens for an address.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just give us a word, Bishop.

BISHOP STEVENS: My Friends — I had no thought of being anything but a hearer and a spectator. My honored brother has uttered the sentiment of my heart in far more impressive language than I myself can do it. I thank God that the war is over, and as I entered into that war in obedience to the one whom I then looked upon as my rightful Commander, and whose orders I felt myself bound to obey, so now I am enlisted under the banner and leadership of the Commander of all the commanders of earth, and His word is "love one another." God speed the day when

there shall be no more fighting between men who have the image of that same God, and who are redeemed by the sacrifice and grace of that one great Captain of our salvation.

Now let me say one single word to my brother from England. I could not help feeling this, as he told us of words spoken expressive of an unkind feeling to England, and more especially as he said there seemed to be a feeling that all should, if possible, get the better of England. This thought came into my mind: — England, the British Empire, the great exponent of the Christian religion, should be foremost in exemplifying that which was expressed by the apostle, "Is it not better to suffer wrong than to do wrong?" (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN. I will now call upon Rev. Dr. Alfred H. Love. He will give us a little talk.

ALFRED H. LOVE, being introduced as Rev. Dr. Love, said:

I do not want titles. I am no D.D. I do not believe divinity needs doctoring (laughter), and I do not believe peace needs doctoring, it is only war that needs it. This is a day of coincidences. I never expected to look upon Bishop Stevens, that man from Stevens' battery that fired the first gun on Fort Sumter. We have a peace exhibit in the great Exposition, and we have on the way from Moline, Illinois, a plough made from swords presented to us by military men and their heirs. Among the swords was that carried by General Anderson on that very occasion. Stevens, now Bishop Stevens, fired that gun.

The message of congratulation for the Behring Sea Arbitration you ordered sent to Queen Victoria and to the President of the United States, I apprehend, is now being read and published in London and in Washington. It marks the growth of the age and of civilization. International Arbitration is one of the means of healing the nations. We are agreed upon this principle that lies near our hearts, and we are inspired to feel that it is the proper remedy, it is one way out of the difficulty. It is the new dispensation. Let us be done with living on mere precedents. It is the age and the time to make precedents. (Applause.) We are nearing the close of the nineteenth century, the precedents that we shall refer to will be those that we shall make. We can make better law from the experience of the past, we can rise higher by the inspirations and revelations of the present, and we will no longer be tied down by mere law books and law precedents, consequently we have got a great work to do. We open the Constitution of the United States and read that we delegate to Congress the right and "power to declare war." I say out with such a power. We have another clause where it says that the President of the United States shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Army and the Navy. Amend it, and out with it. (Applause.) The best clause in the Constitution of the United

States is the last clause, which gives us the right to amend. Now let us make better law, and instead of having a War Department let us have a Peace Department. (Applause.)

It is the strangest thing that with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Post Office, the Secretary of the Interior, all of a constructive nature, we should have a Secretary of a destructive nature.

International Arbitration will give us Secretaryships of Peace and Departments of Peace.

A second decision has been announced from the great arbitral court of the world, the Behring Sea adjustment. The first was when the Alabama question was settled. It was mentioned in your hearing that some of us were early connected with it, but there was a little woman in Philadelphia who attended our Quaker meetings that was one of the first to write to Queen Victoria, Lord Tenterden and to others and suggest that that matter be settled by treaty and by arbitration, and that woman was our beloved and revered friend, Lucretia Mott. (Applause.) That name ought to be sounded in a Congress for Peace. In that sacred hall at Geneva where this Alabama Arbitration took place we have the first plow ever made from swords. These swords were presented to us at the Centennial in Philadelphia and were turned into a beautiful plow. We presented it to Switzerland.

One thing that has grown out of this Behring Sea decision that no one has yet referred to is the protection of seal life. If we are not kind to the lower animals over whom we have control, is it possible or likely that we will be kind to those who are our equals? There is something in the protection of seal life that touches me as a peace measure. Both sides to this arbitrament have united upon kindness to animals with entire unanimity. It seems an evidence that all the rest will be pacific. Begin by being kind to the lower creation and you will be kind to the higher creation. (Applause.)

I feel we must be very tender and charitable to those who regarded it their duty to enter the late war in this country. It was a time of great trial. But there is an obedience higher than man may claim. Let us so instil into our child life that there shall be obedience to the higher law. Let us demand one code of morals for the boy and the girl. It is a mistake for us to have one code of morals that will permit the boy to go to war and another code of morals for the girl. (Applause.) Let us demand that in the Constitution of the United States, in all that we do under law, we shall have one moral law for the Constitution as we would have one great and sacred and moral law for the Scriptures of truth and the Bibles. (Applause.) And when it was announced to-day that Dr. Moxom would speak to us next Sabbath on this question, and he would reserve part of his address for that occasion, I said to myself it is all a Sabbath, all days are

holy days, and as sacred and as good to-day, Thursday, as it would be good on Sunday. (Applause.) Let us ingraft more peace into our Constitutions, into our homes, into our school life. Let our children read more of the arbitraments of the day, as Josiah W. Leeds, of Philadelphia, has brought out in his history of the United States as a Peace Book. Let us have school books suitable for us, such school life of drilling and of discipline that will be in the line of a settlement of difficulties. My mother used to say to me when I did wrong, or when I had any difficulty with brothers and sisters, go and mediate your difficulties, settle them among yourselves. Let us have in our school life, our college and university life, more of this training and disciplining that we may settle difficulties among ourselves, and then have home arbitration, trade arbitration and commercial arbitration in that way. It is one thing to talk about arbitration and to have rules of arbitrament; it is another thing to find somebody who is fit to be an arbitrator, to have that patience and that charity to know the laws, the religion and the feelings of those across the seas, the productions and peculiarities of foreign countries and to have a sympathy with one another the wide world over. First let us teach self control and then train our children to reason together and settle their troubles amicably. This will result in perfecting arbitration by perfecting the arbitrator. We have confidence in the Creator because His judgment is perfection. The nearer we can assimilate our thoughts and actions to His divine commands, the nearer we will be to the consummation of peace.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will have very brief speeches to close the Congress. I will call upon Daniel Hill, who is the venerable Secretary of the Peace Association of the Friends in America, and the editor of the *Messenger of Peace*.

DANIEL HILL: It does my heart good to meet the people here from at least a dozen nationalities. I have been engaged in this work for about a quarter of a century, and when I first began to set forth these peace ideas we were regarded as utopian and visionary. People would hardly listen to us and what meetings we held the public press would hardly notice. It is not so to-day. We are not so lonesome as we used to be. I am glad of it. I know that peace people have an uphill work in educating public opinion, but I am glad to know to-day that in nearly or quite all the civilized nations of the world some of the best thinkers and writers and speakers are now engaged in this work, helping to enlighten public opinion, and bringing the nations up to the point when they will learn a little common sense in settling their difficulties. I know that some people think that peace people are not patriotic, and that nobody can be patriotic unless they want to fight. Now I believe that the best patriots in the world

are those who try their best to keep their country, its government and its people in harmony with the Divine Law. (Applause.)

I don't believe that any nation in the world has anything to fear from any other nation as long as its ways please the Lord. Now I am an American. I love my country, I love it better than any other country. I think I have a right to do so, but, my friends, it doesn't follow that because I love my country I should hate anybody else's country. (Applause.) I love my wife better than anybody else's wife, but I don't hate anybody else's wife. (Applause.) I don't believe the government of the United States could make me hate Dr. Darby so that I would want to kill him, and I don't believe the government of Great Britain could make Dr. Darby hate me so that he would want to shoot me down; and I am glad to meet my Swedish friend here, for we are not responsible for the countries where we were born, and I believe any country is a good country to be born in.

I am glad to meet here the representatives of a dozen nationalities engaged in this great work, because Jesus said, "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God," and I am an adherent of the Prince of Peace. I love this cause because it is the gospel of the Son of God, and because Jesus is the Prince of Peace, and because the gospel is the gospel of peace; and because Jesus has said, "Blessed are the peace-makers for they shall be called the children of God." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now the Rev. Dr. Darby, whom we know in more relations than one, will make the brief closing address. He has been associated with Dr. Tomkins and others in the Association for the Reform and Codification of International Law.

DR. DARBY: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen — As a member with Dr. Tomkins of the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations I am glad of having the opportunity of just saying a word in support of my friend's paper. I am the more glad because, as he has told you in those very pathetic references of his, the association was formed mainly through the instigation of my predecessor, Mr. Henry Richard. It is only just, however, to remind you that the work done by Mr. Richard was shared by Dr. Miles, the Secretary of the American Peace Society. Dr. Miles came over to Europe by the direction of his society to endeavor to start such an association. Now, I want to say that I had intense pleasure in listening to the sound faith of my learned colleague who has given you a paper to-day, and in hearing the other day the paper of another colleague, Mr. David Dudley Field. I listened with unusual pleasure to Mr. Field's paper. There was such a lofty, devout

tone in it; and I detected the same elements to-day in the paper or Dr. Tomkins.

I am sorry to say our association has not been true to the high ideas connected with its formation. It has been drawn away by certain influences, and given more attention to some aspects of international law than it has to those aspects which deal more especially with our peace question.

May I just add one word on the real question under discussion. If I had had the framing of that question on our program, I think I should have used the word "necessity" instead of the word "possibility," and written it thus: The Reform of International Law, Necessity of its Codification by a Permanent International Tribunal. Now, I would put it this way to bring out the real nature of our discussion and to fix its proper place in the order of the discussions of this Congress. This morning you discussed a very important question, "The Formation of a Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration," and you set on foot a movement from which I expect great things. This afternoon, very appropriately, you turned your attention to international law which is to guide that tribunal when it has been formed. The object of that tribunal is to enable the nations to pass over from the brute-force condition of things to a condition of law and order.

Now what is International Law? Law governing international relations, you may say. Is there such a thing? Well, whatever body of international law exists is very indefinite and not distinct and well defined like your American constitution. International law consists of three elements: First, the principles existing in the nature of things; secondly, the usages that have grown up in the intercourse between nations; thirdly, the principles that have been embodied in treaties; now there is another element gradually coming into use. It is the decisions of Courts of Arbitration. When the Geneva Tribunal, for instance, set about its work it had to lay down the lines along which it was to proceed, to fix the principles and form the law which should guide its procedure. Now that has come to be a part of international law.

What is it that the Peace Societies and Peace Congresses have to do with international law? Just this: that all these principles shall be gathered together, their expression perfected, their meaning made clear, and then that these laws shall be codified and arranged so that they shall be readily usable by a Court of Arbitration when established. But who is to do this work? An Association has been formed, represented here by Dr. Tomkins and myself, for that very purpose. It has not, however, dealt so largely, as I have already told you, with the principles in which we are most interested as it might have done. This body of international law, if it is to be arranged and developed and reformed, must be dealt with by an international tribunal. Exposi-

tors of the law may do a great deal, but mere expounders of the law have not the authority to make nations recognize the principles which shall govern their conduct and by which their differences shall be tried; hence the necessity of the reform of international law and of its codification by a permanent international tribunal. We have a definite end before us, and we cannot be content with the mere discussion of abstract principles. We want to carry them out into practice, and we want to establish regulations which shall be acknowledged by all as authoritative.

One other remark. I am delighted to hear Dr. Moxom's distinct statement as to the sufficiency of moral sanction. Last year in the Congress at Berne we had a discussion on that very point and some of us had to stand almost alone in the Congress, in our convictions. Dr. Moxom came to me at the close of the discussion and made the remark that the more he considered the question the more he was convinced that the moral sanction of the people was sufficient for the enforcement of arbitral decrees. He has gone a step further to-day and has put before you very clearly what I should be tempted to say a few words about if I had time, that law, after all, depends for its observance not upon the soldier or the policeman but upon the moral sense of the people — upon public opinion.

In my judgment, all that is necessary for the enforcement of arbitral decrees is moral sanction. In all these decisions that have been given to the world you have not had an army to enforce the judgment of the Court. You have in the United States a standing army of twenty-five thousand men. I venture to say that if two of your great nations decided not to abide by a decision of your Supreme Court, your twenty-five thousand men would be very inadequate to enforce obedience. No, you have something better, and with all my heart I want to bear my testimony to the grand position of your nation, the grand work you are doing, though you know it not. Nations often, like men, build better than they know, and you are embodying the principles that shall govern the world of the future. You are showing how great, difficult questions may be settled without quarrelling like brute beasts. You have your code of international law. Mr. President, I wish to withdraw what I said about the indefiniteness of international law so far as it refers to the international law of the United States. You might tell me that was a national law, but when your nations band together and are called States they are none the less nations. By and by the whole world will be banded together into one great community, live beneath one constitution, the sweetness of which will carry with it the conviction and moral sense and obedience of all its subjects.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hartman wishes to say a word.

MR. HARTMAN: Mr. Chairman — It is patent to any man in any nation that war is consumptive and destructive; it has been so

from time immemorial, is now and will ever be. It cannot be any thing else. Therefore, at a glance it must be seen that the burden of war must come upon the people, and be borne by them. But why must the population of any nation and its industries be brought into requisition, to clothe, feed and maintain armies? Millions of men are clothed and fed in idleness. Millions of money are put into war-ships, large guns, fortresses, and those men are put there and kept there and are of no more use unless it be to go to war. Why this waste of time and energy? I say it is time that the people of the nations should open their eyes and learn a little common sense. The diplomats and rulers should be made to relegate these barbarous institutions to the things of the past. All this money, spent in war preparations if used in the industries of life, would be a source of great happiness and blessing to the world.

Our own nation, being so favorably situated, has an opportunity to set a good example in this respect. We are giving an object lesson with our army of twenty-five thousand men. It is only a police force to keep in subjection refractory, half civilized people; certainly it is not needed by the civilized; hence it will pass away after a while, and these men will come into the pursuits of ordinary life, just as those of us who were for four long years in the civil war have done.

We must get rid of the waste and terror and tears and cries that come of war. This great bugbear of the nations that you hear of everywhere must be destroyed. There will be an end to it one of these days, and there will be no more widows and orphans wearing mourning all their lives for their fathers and brothers. That will be a climax of happiness such as was never known in this world — come surely it will. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Campbell wishes to make an acknowledgment before the Congress adjourns.

DR. CAMPBELL: I do not ask the privilege of making a speech but simply of making an acknowledgment. The Ecclesiastical Peace Congress, upon whose session yesterday many of you attended, has passed a resolution of thanks to the World's Congress Auxiliary and especially to the Committee of Arrangements of the Peace Congress, and particularly to Dr. Trueblood, who made the arrangements for our meeting. Whilst we are working in one particular line, yet we join you very cordially and bid you God speed in all your work.

Adjourned.

EIGHTH SESSION.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 18TH, 10 A. M.

The Congress was called to order at 10 A. M. in the Hall of Columbus.

The meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Julius E. Grammer, after which Alfred H. Love of Philadelphia was introduced as chairman of the session and spoke as follows :

MY FRIENDS — It is very gratifying to me to meet all of you this morning and to occupy the chair of the Congress, which has been so ably filled by those who have presided on this very important occasion, which is to me the realization of a hope I long have had and for half a century have labored to attain.

The few remarks I have to make will be on what we should be and what we can do, to bring about this great desire of our hearts, or, in other words,

THE CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL TO PEACE.

The discovery of a continent is an achievement, the discovery of a principle is a victory. The government of a continent is a benefaction, the adaptation of a principle to a government that will insure prosperity and happiness to the governed is a benediction.

You who have assembled now from all parts of the world, for the fifth time, as the Universal Peace Congress, hold in your hearts the talisman of joy. It has been revealed unto you by the greatest of all pacificators, the Author of peace, the Father of us all, that if man "be created in the image of God," he must have attributes like unto God. War, the military system and deadly force are not a part thereof; but Peace, the attributes of Peace, and all that go to make such a condition as possible as it is desirable, are a part thereof. There are undeveloped forces in the nature of man that need to be discovered, applied and recognized as fundamental and saving. These are the forces of Peace. They are more potent than armies and more invincible than forts or ironclads. How to popularize and utilize them is the question before an anxious world. If there be the marvellous wisdom and power that this Chicago Exposition makes manifest, as the handiwork and genius of mankind, who will dare deny that there is a mental and a spiritual power commensurate with it all that can

preserve what it produces, and crown with the glory of fraternal relationship and enduring peace, that which it creates. It cannot be that with the productive wonders that we see around us, man must continue to blunder with the very cap-stone. It cannot be that we are given to see a higher and better civilization, new countries, as it were, to discover, and yet have our hands tied that we cannot realize our ideals.

We know the horrors, the bankruptcy, the cruelty, the wickedness, the inexpediency of war and the military system, and we know the blessings of peace. We are called, or wish to be called, a courageous people. Why not prove this by our being willing to accept the peace platform, and leave results to the inexorable result that "as ye sow likewise shall ye reap." Peace is a manufactured article. It comes from the conditions of Peace being so in harmony with itself, that it naturally produces Peace. The angel of Peace will not come into hearts and homes and nations where there is no preparation to receive and no deserving of such a guest. We may, nevertheless, profitably assemble and consider great questions of disarmament and arbitration, of international fraternity and reciprocal commercial relations, of treaties of Peace and universal congresses. All these things are evidences of the progress of the age, of the yearning of the people and of the possibilities of man. Better than revolution, better than evolution, it is *provolution*. And yet they are but a patch-work covering of the demands of the hour, good as far as they go, but not going as far as goodness. It neither satisfies the revelations of time and perfect Peace nor secures universal establishment thereof. "We cannot serve two masters." As individuals we cannot have enmity in our hearts, and pretend to love one another, and be at Peace. As nations we cannot have fear and jealousy of other nations, and arm and prepare for war, and have peaceful relations that are satisfactory and enduring.

As well might we attempt to reverse the laws of gravitation, or counteract the inimitable order of the universe, as to expect perfect and enduring Peace, while man permits and nations continue to put their trust in carnal weapons and deadly force; preaching in their churches and professing one thing and practising another; upholding military academies; organizing their men (remember—not their women) into armies; spending their substance in fortifications and battle-ships; coveting their neighbors' territory; sailing over the seas and laying claim to lands far beyond their homes and coercing with military power the weaker, defenceless and less favored.

Hence there are conditions that are essential to Peace. We must remove the causes and abolish the customs of war. True, we would not be without this present manifestation and effort for Peace. If it does nothing else, it is at least educational, but we do not wish it to be regarded as an ultimatum. We will co-oper-

ate with everything that looks towards the goal of our desires. We will favor a general system of disarmament; the creation of Courts of Arbitration; the establishment of Peace Bureaus and the substitution of Peace Departments in Governments, in lieu of War Departments. We will hold in high reverence the Peace agencies we believe we already have in the church, the home and the school-house; in the postal and telegraph systems whereby the word of Peace may be communicated, errors corrected and rights upheld; in the locomotive facility, whereby we can visit and clasp in fraternal comity the hands of each other, and understand the healing and pacific power of touch; in the commercial intercourse between nations, whereby the wants of each other may be supplied; in the minister plenipotentiary and consular system, whereby each government is represented at home and abroad; and ready at any time to explain misunderstandings and uphold the amenities of nations; in the inter-marriage relations, whereby the attachments of loving souls of different countries, make in household joys and homes, though widely separated, one country and one interest, as children and children's children weaving the net-work of a patriotism that comprehends the whole planet on which we live, and is not satisfied with merely a limited territory of boundaries or of government; we will increase the heart-beats of that common sympathy of mankind that courses in every vein throughout the world, that will aid the fallen, sustain the weak and relieve the suffering, as we all suffer the same pains and rejoice in the same joys; and last and greatest we will aid the recognition, in some form or other, of a reverence for the Creator and gratitude for the beauty and bounty vouchsafed to every nation, tongue and people.

We repeat, we will hold to these as peacemakers. Unwittingly in the history of the world we have a ground-work for our peace. It is our hope ahead! Let us use and not abuse the heritage. Let us never be satisfied with the mere veneering of peace upon our body politic or our humanity, but demand practice equal to profession. If there be found those who because of religious proclivities subscribe to the declaration, "Thou shalt not kill," let us hold them to it, and say it means what it says without mental reservation or partial observance. If there be found those who sanctify the declaration, "Love your enemies," and pray, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us," let us note how they love their enemies, and in what manner they forgive those who trespass against them, and require obedience thereto. And if there be found those who, whether Jew or Gentile, feel in their own consciences that it is wrong to injure, destroy, maim and kill, let us hold them to obedience to this inner light. Peace hates duplicity, and admits of no hypocrisy.

Hence, among the essential conditions of peace, we hold self-control, that each individual shall begin at home and have peace

within himself ; less of selfishness, of jealousy, of anger, but “ do unto others as we would that others do unto us ;” that in homes and communities there be more of love and the practice of the peace principles in the correction of faults ; no whipping of children, no warlike playthings, no exciting war stories, no military drills, or soldier companies, no boys’ brigades, but a most determined protest against the churches and schools that recently have introduced and encouraged these monstrous perversions of their professions, and are surely implanting the martial spirit in the young, and counteracting the earnest efforts of peace reformers. If we have not a conviction deeper than any human sophistry ; a hope that cannot be blighted by temporary disappointments ; a record equal to any criticism ; a faith that will remove mountains ; a love superior to any man’s hate ; a charity broad enough to extend to the ends of the earth, recognizing that there is some good in every one ; and a dependence upon the Divine Power, even unto martyrdom, we have no right to expect Universal Peace.

We hold that laws must recognize the sacredness of human life upon the scaffold and upon the battle-field ; that deadly force shall be abolished, and as a substitute that all differences that cannot be settled by ordinary diplomacy, shall be submitted to wise and impartial arbitration, the contracting parties agreeing to abide by the decision ; that the study and practice of arbitration be introduced into schools and colleges, that we may educate and qualify the people to be arbitrators ; that appropriations for the army and navy, the building of battle-ships and fortifications, cease, except to convert them into hospitals and merchantmen, and form an international relief fund for the aid of mankind, irrespective of nationality, wherever there may be loss, distress and suffering beyond their local power to relieve. Such a fund can be easily created when there are no war vessels to build, no standing armies to support, no war pensions to provide. Here would be the grandest pension-fund the world has ever known, cementing the nations into a common brotherhood, because of a common humanity.

Let the spirit of republicanism grow deeper and broader, such a spirit that comprehends freedom, justice, equal rights, charity, a world-wide philanthropy, temperance, and a friendly rivalry as to who can do the most good for his fellow-man, or show the highest gratitude to the Creator. As a means to this coveted end, let such congresses as these multiply ; let these world’s exhibitions of the genius of man be repeated, not, however, beyond the claims of economy, fair play, propriety and safety, but with the object of bringing all mankind into closer and more friendly relationship. Then will emperors and kings, and those in power everywhere, realize in time that all these things make for the prosperity and happiness of the people, for the people will be employed in “ following after those things which make for peace,” and by “ doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly.”

FELIX MOSCHELES of London sent the following letter which was read by the Secretary :

123 Church St., CHELSEA, LONDON.

DR. B. F. TRUEBLOOD, Chicago.

Dear [Sir — Will you kindly convey to my American and European friends assembled at the Peace Congress my most sincere regret at my not being able to join them on the auspicious occasion that has brought them together.

It has three times been my good fortune to visit the United States, and I was each time impressed by the fact that the problem which seems impossible of attainment on this side is realized on the other one. You have a solid union of States focused at Washington and you have that great element of concord which is needed to cement all political union, Free Trade, extending from one end to another of your vast territory.

The United States are an object lesson, forcibly demonstrating the fact that federation is better than separation, and practically pointing to the benefits and advantages to be derived from the close alliance of a multitude of nationalities and races.

On festive occasions it is the practice with us in England to open up a series of speeches with toasts to the Queen and royal family and to the army and navy. Slightly following this example, only dropping for obvious reasons the army and navy, I will wish a prosperous term of office to the illustrious citizen now shaking many hands at the White House. It was my good fortune to have an opportunity of buttonholing him, such as only an artist has when he is painting a portrait, and it was on that occasion I could form an opinion, subsequently corroborated, that President Cleveland is and always will be, not only a friend of Peace, but also a friend to the Peace movement and a supporter of those who are seeking to establish a new and sound basis for international intercourse.

The keystone to the edifice we are ambitious to rear, is, I believe, the ever growing desire in the United States and in England to establish permanent Tribunals of Arbitration between the two countries. Of friendship between them, there is — I say so, without fear of contradiction — enough and to spare, and it only remains to find a form in which that feeling of friendship can be crystallized.

Speaking as a member of the Executive of the Old Peace Society and of the International Arbitration Association, I venture to say, not only in my name, but in the name of my colleagues, that we are working heart and soul to bring about that happiest of consummations.

When that perennial tunnel, the Mont Cenis, was to be constructed, the workers started from either side of the mountain

and toiled with unremitting energy for many a month and year, till at last they met at the very point they had set out to reach. The last wall fell and the balmy air of sunny Italy mingled with the fresh breeze of her northern sister. So too, on either side of the ocean, are we plodding on towards a common goal, ever hammering away, boring holes in the arguments of obstructionists and exploding old theories and prejudices.

We shall meet; perhaps sooner than we think, perhaps later than we hope; but we shall meet. The last wall will crumble before our combined efforts and a new current of invigorating, health-bringing air will regenerate the two great nations, the foremost representatives of the English-speaking race.

I am yours most sincerely,

FELIX MOSCHELES.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me now introduce to you a friend from our own City of Philadelphia, former President of the "Christian Arbitration and Peace Association" and the friend of mankind, the Rev. George Dana Boardman, who will speak on the "Relation of Nationalism to Internationalism, or Mankind one Body."

DR. BOARDMAN then read the following paper:

NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM; OR MANKIND ONE BODY.

LANATUS' FABLE OF THE BELLY AND THE MEMBERS.

When, in the days of early Rome, the plebeians, in their first great rupture with the patricians, angrily seceded to the Sacred Mount, the venerable and patriotic Menenius Agrippa Lanatus, himself a worthy patrician, effected a reconciliation by his famous apologue of the Belly and the Members, as follows:

"In olden times, when every Member of the body could think for itself, and each had a separate will of its own, they all, with one consent, resolved to revolt against the Belly. They knew no reason, they said, why they should toil from morning to night in its service, while the Belly lay at its ease in the midst of all, and indolently grew fat upon their labors. Accordingly, they agreed to support it no more. The feet vowed they would carry it no longer; the hands that they would do no more work; the teeth that they would not chew another morsel of meat, even were it placed between them. Thus resolved, the Members for a time showed their spirit and kept their resolution. But they soon found that, instead of mortifying the Belly, they only reduced themselves to the last degree of emaciation."

ST. PAUL'S ANALOGY OF THE HUMAN BODY.

More than five hundred years afterwards, another Roman citizen, seeking to reconcile factions which were rending a certain community in Corinth, and perhaps remembering the apologue of old Lanatus, wrote as follows :

“As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body ; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free ; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body ; it is not therefore not of the body. And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body ; it is not therefore not of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing ? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling ? But now hath God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body ? But now they are many members, but one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee ; or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much rather, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary ; and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor ; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness ; whereas our comely parts have no need ; but God tempered the body together, giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked ; that there should be no schism (rent, dismemberment) in the body ; but that the members should have the same care for one another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it ; or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and several members thereof (members each in his part”).
1 Cor. 12 :12-27.

THE BODY A SYMBOL OF MANKIND.

But while the Roman Lanatus applied his analogy of the body only to the Roman State, I think we are justified in applying it to that mightier State or Body which we call Mankind. Not, of course, that this bodily conception of Mankind is literally true ; not as though it were really a physiological structure, having corporal organs. But it is ideally true. And ideas are often the truest of things. As the human body is a single organism, consisting of many different organs and functions, balanced in common counterpoise, and working in mutual interaction ; so Mankind is a single moral organism, in like manner consisting of many diversities, balanced in similar counterpoise, and working in similar interaction. In other words, the relation of nationalism to internationalism is the relation of the members to the body.

It is Christianity's positive, majestic contribution to Sociology, or the Philosophy of Society. For it is only when we conceive mankind as one colossal body, having all its organs in co-ordination and all its functions in reciprocal action, that we can truly grasp this mighty word — SOCIETY. It is a sublime conception; which shall yet, by God's grace, dominate humanity. Let me go somewhat into detail.

“ BODY ” IMPLIES DIVERSE “ MEMBERS.”

On the one hand, the term “ body ” itself implies “ members.” And “ members ” imply specific functions. Accordingly, in the one great nation of Mankind, the individuality of the component nations is still preserved. For each nation — oh, that all the nations understood it! — is charged with its own divine mission. Viewed in this light, each nation is, for the moment, a single person. Recall how Jehovah, in proclaiming his Ten Commandments, addressed the millions of Israel as a single personality or one corporate unity, saying: “ I am Jehovah *thy* God, who brought *thee* out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.” The Jews, surveyed as individuals, were many Israelites: the Jews, surveyed as a nation of individuals, were one Israel. But Israel was not the only nation that is a person. Every nation, worthy of the name of nation, is also a person, having at least some of the attributes of personality; that is, each nation has its own idiosyncrasies. Recall, for example, Egyptian seriousness; Hebrew devoutness; Greek culture; Roman jurisprudence; Gothic impetuosity; Italian æstheticism; Chinese conservatism; Japanese flexibility; Indian (Asiatic) mysticism; Indian (American) nomadism; African docility; Scandinavian valor; Russian persistence; Swiss federalism; Spanish dignity; French savoir-faire; German philosophism; English indomitableness; Scotch shrewdness; Irish humor; Welsh eloquence; Canadian thrift; American versatility. Each nation has its own rôle definitely assigned it in the great drama of Mankind. What an insight into the philosophy of history the great missionary Apostle gives us when, addressing the proud autochthones of the Areopagus, he announced:

“ God made of one (blood, nature) every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitations.” Acts 17: 26.

“ MEMBERS ” IMPLY A COMMON “ BODY.”

On the other hand, the term “ members ” itself implies a common “ body.” If they were all one member, where were the body? But now they are many members, but one body. Accordingly, while it is true that each nation has its own individual mission, it is also true that all the nations constitute one common Nation, namely, the one august body of mankind, the one sublime corpus or corporation of the human race; whereof each nation is,

so to speak, a component member, and each individual a specific organ, having its own definite function to discharge in the one organism of Humanity. In other words, each nation, in simple virtue of its own existence as a nation, is also strictly international; being a corporate member of the one divinely incorporated Society of Mankind; so that its relation to its fellow-nations is a relation, not of hostile competition, but of integral co-operation. Precisely here, my countrymen, is one of the rich providential meanings of that sublime event in the history of mankind which our Columbian Exposition is here commemorating. For it is the rare felicity of America, in virtue of our geographical isolation, being laved on both coasts by mighty oceans, and also in virtue of our political isolation, being free from what Jefferson called "entangling alliances" with foreign nations, that we occupy the vantage ground of being, to large extent, the neutral territory of the nations, and therefore the natural mediator for the peoples. It is the majestic possibility of America, that, looking toward the Northern Aurora, she can, as it were, extend her right hand across the Atlantic, and her left hand across the Pacific, and speak peace to the trans-oceanic races; or, as George Canning, in his "King's Message," says:—"I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." But America can never realize this magnificent prerogative until she distinctly conceives herself as being not only national, but also international; not only as one great nation among other great nations, but also as a corporate, organic member of a still vaster Nation, even the body politic of Humanity, the corporation of Humankind. Now the discovery of America, by opening the two great oceans of Atlantic and Pacific for common transit and intercourse and property, made the two hemispheres complementary, rounding the angles of the nations into the one globe of Mankind; thus realizing the Pauline conception of making of the old twain the one new man in Christ. In fine, we shall never get beyond St. Paul's fundamental conception of the ideal Society, to wit, this: "**WE ARE MEMBERS ONE OF ANOTHER.**" Accordingly, what mankind needs is the sense of what our French brothers call *esprit de corps*. And this *esprit de corps*, this sense of mankind comes to mankind only through the avenue and in the sphere of the Christian incarnation, or the embodiment of God in Jesus of Nazareth.

WAR IS SOCIAL SELF-MAIMING.

¶ And now let me apply this sublime idea of international life or corporate mankind to that frequent and sad violation of it, namely, war. For, from what I have said concerning the bodily organism as the divine ideal of the one organic humanity, it follows that all war is social self-maiming. Indeed, it is just because we persist in conceiving society as a mechanical organization, like Hobbe's "Leviathan," rather than as a natural organ-

ism, like the human body, that we also persist in resorting to mechanical methods like war, rather than to natural methods like peace, for settling human quarrels. In fact, war is the culminating instance of what St. Paul calls a "schism in the body;" that is, rending asunder human society, or dismemberment of mankind.

PAST WARS SOMETIMES RELATIVELY RIGHT.

I would speak advisedly and justly. Devoutly believing as I do in the Bible, I must admit that, in the inscrutable counsels of the Eternal, even war has had its divine office; as, for example, when Jehovah used it as his minister of doom against the Canaanites. For aught I know, even heathen Attila himself was rightly named "The Scourge of God." No doubt there is a sense in which it is true that the instinct of self-defence is divinely implanted. But self-defence, at least physical, is not one of the ordinary conditions of society; it is an exceptional emergency; and it is manifestly absurd to deduce a rule from an exception.

GOD'S GOVERNMENT PROGRESSIVE.

Besides, we are living under the government of Almighty God. One of the fundamental principles of that government is progress. Accordingly, what may have been relatively right in the past may be absolutely wrong in the future. For we must distinguish between absolute truth, or truth as it exists unconditionally in the infinite mind, and relative truth, or truth as it appears to our finite minds, now under this set of conditions, now under that set. In other words, God, in revealing himself to men, has been pleased to use the law of adaptation; or, as the philosophers say, "the law of economy of action." For example:—Christ, in his doctrine of divorce, admitted that Moses allowed his countrymen a bill of divorcement for other causes than the cause which Christ himself specifies; but he immediately adds that Moses allowed divorcement because of his countrymen's "hardness of heart;" that is, because of that moral obtuseness into which they had sunk as one of the sad results of their long servitude in polygamous Egypt; but it was not so in the beginning; in Eden's primal estate no provision was made for divorce. And as it was with divorce, so it was with polygamy, slavery, retaliation, war: "In the generations gone by God suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways; those being times of ignorance which God winked at, overlooked."

FUTURE WARS ABSOLUTELY WRONG.

But now the times of knowledge have come. God, who in former times spoke to the fathers through the prophets, now speaks to us in his Son. That Son commands us, not from the wrathful heights of Sinai, but from the peaceful heights of Calvary. Moses said:—"Eye for eye, life for life." Jesus says:—"If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to

drink." And Jesus is gaining on Moses. Even within the comparatively short time since our own desolating strife ceased, the conceptions of men concerning mankind have wonderfully cleared and broadened; the great problem of Sociology itself has come conspicuously to the very front of human thinking. In fact, this great problem is no longer a local problem concerning societies or men; it is henceforth a universal problem concerning Society or Man. We are beginning to see that war of whatever kind, foreign as well as civic, is suicidal as well as murderous. It is as though the members should again revolt against the belly, or the foot should kick against the eye, or the right hand amputate the left. In fact, it is war which is the real stupidity; it is peace which is the real sagacity. The time is fast passing by when thoughtful men will any longer cherish the sentimental tradition and barbarous fancy that a question of national honor or international right can really be settled by an appeal to gunnery, however elaborate. If we were materialists, and really believed that the national honor consists in a peculiarly deft arrangement of molecules, then we might consistently defend the national honor by a molecular appeal. In fact, brute force is the animal's standard of ethics. As good Isaac Watts, in lines more remarkable for accuracy of observation than for accuracy of theology, naively sings:

" Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let bears and lions growl and fight,
For 'tis their nature, too."

But, if we believe that right and honor and truth are in their nature spiritual, not carnal, then let the weapons of our warfare be also spiritual, not carnal; so shall we become mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds.

DIVINE SUMMONS TO DISARMAMENT.

Here, then, I take my stand as a Christian man. Solemnly believing that the policy of my Divine Master is a policy of peace, I as solemnly believe that my Divine Master is summoning earth's nations to a policy of disarmament. How they shall effect this disarmament — whether suddenly or gradually, whether separately or simultaneously — I do not presume to assert. But I do presume to assert, unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly, that the time has come when the nations should commit themselves openly to the policy of disarmament. I remember, indeed, that George Washington declared before Congress that "to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Allow me, however, to submit, as I do most humbly, whether, in this late age of Christendom the converse of Washington's maxim is not even truer:— *To prepare for peace by disarming is the most effectual means of preventing war.* Nor is this suggestion novel; so long ago as 1798, Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Dec-

laration of Independence, proposed the establishment of a Peace Department which should be co-ordinate with the Army and Navy Departments. I am well aware of the gravity of the problem. I believe that we still need a body of armed men who shall serve, if you please, as our National Police on land and sea. But let us be peacefully content with calling it our police department instead of vaunting it as our military armament, ready to accept and, if need be, offer martial challenge. Of course many will call me an idealist. But ideals have ever been the uplifting forces for humanity. The visionary of to-day is the conqueror of to-morrow.

AMERICA'S GREAT OPPORTUNITY.

Meanwhile, if I had the ear of my beloved Country, I would venture to offer this suggestion: Let our American nation *propose to our brother nations to disarm*; substituting arbitration, or some other pacific policy, for armament. I feel sure that all of us, whether Republicans or Democrats, whether natives or immigrants, will agree that, if there is on earth a nation that can afford to disarm and be known as the great peace-people, it is the American nation; for our fortunes do not vibrate in the oscillating balance of European powers, We are strong enough, and ought to be brave enough, to say to our brother-nations of Man-kind:—

We believe that war is a foolish and wicked policy. Let us disarm, referring our disputes, not to the bloody decisions of capricious war, but to the peaceful arbitrament of Christian common-sense. Let us enter into a covenant of everlasting amity; organizing a peace league that shall be not only pan-American but also pan-Human. We Americans take the initiative in inviting all the nations of the earth to meet with us in that greatest of Congresses,

“THE PARLIAMENT OF MAN, THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD.”

DISARMAMENT PRACTICABLE.

Nor is this by any means impracticable. For example: The Geneva Arbitration alone has done wonders in shedding light on the feasibility and duty of disarmament: for it has shown us how war may be averted, and the national honor be kept unstained. Within our own century, there have been seventy-six cases of successful international arbitration; to nearly one-half of which, I am proud to say, the United States has been a party. What an inspiring spectacle to the nations is the pending Behring Sea Arbitration! Do you say that our Master's precept of non-resistance is visionary? The pacific policy of William Penn, founder of the great Commonwealth which bears his own friendly name, fighting barbarous aborigines with no sword but the olive branch—this is the sufficient answer. Talk about Utopia? Bravely obey Jesus Christ; and Utopia—ideal land of Nowhere—becomes Actuality—real land of Everywhere.

SUMMARY.

Here I rest my argument. I might, of course, have brought forth other considerations, more familiar perhaps, but in my judgment, less momentous. I might, for instance, have desecanted on the wastefulness of war; its frightful waste of money, of time, of strength, of health, of capacity, of love, of joy, of morals — in one great word — of life. Never producing, forever consuming — this is the very genius of that monstrous, pitiless, ghastly fugitive from the infernal abyss, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon; in the Greek, Apollyon; in the English, Destroyer. England's Iron Duke, "foremost captain of his time," never said a truer or sadder thing than in his dispatch from the red field of Waterloo: "Nothing except a battle lost can be half so melancholy as a battle won." But, while such considerations as these might perhaps have been more thrilling, I have chosen to take higher ground, appealing to a loftier principle. That loftier principle is this: *The divine conception of all mankind as one single body, one colossal moral organism.* In this majestic conception lies the secret of the reconciliation of the great schism in the one body of humanity. The cure of war lies not in the suspicion and enmity and rivalry that are entrenched in armaments; the cure of war lies in the confidence and brotherhood and co-operation that are announced in disarmament. For in what proportion mankind feels itself to be what its Maker and Lord meant it should be, namely, one organic person rather than a congeries of organized structures — in that proportion race strifes will cease, nation saying to nation: "We are members of one another." Accordingly, what mankind needs is to be educated into the perception of the possibility of its own moral equilibrium; the sense of its own social equipoise.

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and forts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals nor forts."

LONGFELLOW.

DR. DARBY of London was then introduced and said:

I have received a cablegram to the Congress and I ask permission to communicate it myself because it may need a word of explanation. It is as follows:

"Henry Richard's admirers gathered at his birthplace heartily greet the International Peace Congress."

The explanation is simply this: A number of the admirers of Henry Richard resolved to place a statue at his birth-place, Tregaron, in South Wales. They have been for some time discussing it; at last the statue is completed and enthusiastic Welshmen from all parts have gathered at Tregaron to-day to unveil and dedicate this statue, to show their warm affection for

Mr. Richard, and this telegram has come from them. They remember that we are here sitting in session, and so they send their warm greetings to the Peace Congress, and I have peculiar pleasure in making them known.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have unusual pleasure in introducing the next speaker, ex-Gov. John W. Hoyt, of Washington, D. C.

MY FRIENDS — I confess to some sense of hesitation, if not of trembling, this morning in view of the fact that while I was under engagement to present, on this important occasion, a paper on a theme to be forwarded to the Chairman of the Committee of Arrangements, I am here not only without a formal paper but also under some embarrassment at not having been able to be present at previous sessions of this Congress; hence I find myself in doubt whether or not I am travelling over the ground already covered more ably by other speakers.

This, perhaps, matters not, if we can, after all, reinforce each other. There are few new ideas in the world. I could produce nothing startling even if I would. I am here to speak of the fraternal union of peoples, and to discuss it from the standpoint of motives and means.

The motives of peace are surely many, as they are incalculable. The motives which pertain to economy, it would seem, should have impressed themselves upon all nations.

After the war-experience of thousands of years, it would seem that the economy of peace would be so strong as a conviction as to restrain mankind from war. War, as Dr. Boardman well said, is ever waste, waste, only waste, except it be a war of defence or self-preservation — all wars are a source of waste, in any event. Who can estimate the countless millions upon millions that have been wasted in munitions of war, supplies for armies, equipments, clothing, means of transportation! Sum up the wars which have prevailed in the world; the great wars; only a few of them; and your arithmetic fails you. It is impossible to have any accurate comprehension of the national resources wasted, the money wrung from the hand of toil, that it may scatter death and devastation over an Empire.

For four years and more, our fellow countrymen, North and South, born under one common flag, inheritors of one glorious destiny, bathed their hands in each other's blood, and the story of the waste is half told only, when we speak of ten thousand millions of dollars. The waste of lives, who can compute that? The life dear to you, my sister, the life which you gave to save the flag of your country, when you buckled the sword upon your best beloved and sent him forth to struggle for what you believed, and he believed, to be right! Six hundred thousand of

those lives were sacrificed in the late American war. And then the waste in sympathy, the tears, the distress of soul, the intolerable agony of those left behind, able only to pray and work to furnish yet further means to carry on fratricidal war. All wars are fratricidal, as we shall see further on.

Economy is not the only element of which I would speak under the head of motives. There is a higher motive to duty. War is not only waste, but, what is worse, it is demoralization. It nurses and strengthens the baser passions of the soul, and hate grows up in place of the love which should prevail in every human heart. Duty should, after all, be the great motive, for while war is demoralization peace cultivates, develops and strengthens the finer sentiments of the soul, those elevated and noble qualities of the human heart, through whose exercise man rises from a lower to a higher and higher plane. The great and good in all ages have recognized this. Peace and love! So it was that in India Buddha taught the great doctrine of love and brotherhood and Confucius in China likewise; and last of all, greatest of all, Jesus of Nazareth, the Prince of Peace.

The duty of brotherhood, the duty to maintain peace, which great souls of all countries and of all ages have inculcated is for the soul itself a great and holy inspiration.

Then comes the next idea, responsibility for others. "Cain, where is thy brother?" "Am I my brother's keeper?" This, the voice of God at the beginning, was a declaration of brotherhood. "Cain, where is thy brother?" Has this not sounded in the ear of all the generations? If it has not been heard, it is not because it has not been voiced by the Almighty through all the ages.

Brotherhood is the great truth which has come from above, the sublime and beautiful truth which Christ gave to the world and upon which He founded his religion, a religion which has often been perverted with followers devoted to the teaching of dogmas to the neglect of these broad truths of humanity. It is well for us to take up anew and come back to this great central truth in the interest of mankind. "Ye have heard it has been said thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you love your enemies, love thy neighbor as thyself." This doctrine of love is the doctrine of this Congress; is the doctrine which is to be promulgated in all lands ere peace, harmony and prosperity can prevail.

Waste, demoralization on the one hand, conservation, growth, enjoyment and well being on the other; waste and wretchedness on the one hand, conservation, peace and plenitude on the other — and yet the nations stand hesitating to-day! But thank God there is the beginning of a better time, the dawn of a new era. We already see the day-star in the East. This gathering of itself is a sign, a blessed sign of a better understanding of man's rela-

tion to his fellow man, and this relation of man to his fellow man as an individual leads up to the fraternal relation of peoples, for peoples are but aggregations of individuals, and there is one law, one moral law, for the individual, for the community, and for the nation. That love which is enjoined upon us as individuals, which is to be cherished for our brother, is the very love which one nation is to cherish for another, and as the brotherhood of the members of one family make sweet and blessed the family circle, so will the love of nation for nation, as members of one common body, as the Doctor justly said, bind together the nations in one grand family and make everywhere a blessedness of which to-day we have no conception.

I must not delay too long. I have something to say of means and methods. They have already been enlarged upon by many speakers and they have been appreciated by all present. How are these great ends to be realized? There is a new longing among the best minds in all nations of the world for the reign of peace. The burdens, the distress, the demoralization of war have been so deeply felt that there is a looking and longing for a better condition of things and the time is here when the great and good of every land, if they would but join hands, may bring about this grand and glorious consummation.

The means are various. Indirect means will go on, but they may be very greatly improved. I was pleased with the remark of one speaker, who, in his reference to the schools of the country, condemned the inculcation of that spirit of war still found in some text-books and which finds expression in the zeal of some false and misguided teachers. The school is the beginning, the place where children are taught their first lessons; where they get the beginnings of science and philosophy. The mind is then tender, it is impressionable. Here is the place to begin the inculcation of peace. So, instead of heroes with gaudy sword and plume, we should place upon the wall pictures of promoters of peace, of men and women who have advanced the work of science, discovery and philanthropy, so that children growing up may go out from the school room with just ideas of what is really noble and great and worthy to be admired.

The press is the most powerful agent for the advancement of any cause; for while the Church is a power and might be a greater power, the press, especially in a country where every body reads day by day, where journals are sent forth as the leaves of the forest, is the most potent of all influences. The press might become a power for peace if there were a peace editor on every staff—a man in whose heart was the love of peace, a man who recognized the truths that have been enunciated from this platform and that now lay hold upon the heart and conscience of mankind. If there were even one such upon the staff of every great journal whose heart was in this

cause and to whom a reasonable space were allowed, the cause of peace would rapidly grow and prevail.

The indirect agencies are potent, they are incalculable ; but there are direct agencies and this is one of them, this Peace Congress organized here to-day ; Peace Societies also of which our brother Love (well named) has been so long a leader and foremost member ; peace organizations which by various agencies are able to lay before the minds of men, whenever they can be reached, the principles of peace, the evils of war, and to inculcate sentiments looking to the organization of systems formed on the brotherhood of men and nations.

The Exposition of the industries of the world we have here in Jackson Park is perhaps the grandest peace congress ever assembled. The gathering of the results of the productive agencies of all the civilized peoples of the world, the exchange of thought by men from many lands, are producing a sentiment of friendship deeper and stronger than has yet existed.

Who that has grasped the hand of the noble men and women from England, France, Germany, Russia, Spain, Italy, India, China, Japan and Siam, from countries far south and from the islands of the sea, who that has listened to their voices and looked into their eyes and formed some attachment for them will not be more unwilling to see war waged between this and any other land, or between any foreign land and any other foreign land ? We can measure the products of industry, in some degree, and the growth of scientific discovery, but the blessing of association and intercourse leading to brotherhood, these God alone can understand and estimate.

And so day by day as I have toiled in this colossal Exposition I have felt how strong its influences are for the uplifting, for the binding together of mankind.

THE CHAIRMAN : I think you had better explain your position in the Exposition.

MR. HOYT : I would not have alluded to that, but since requested by the Chairman I will say I was drawn here from duties that held me at Washington, a place which I have held half a lifetime, that I might contribute somewhat to the reconciliation of nations not wholly in harmony. My duties have brought me constantly into relations with the representatives of all lands making exhibits in Jackson Park. So it is, as I have stated, I have found there beating the same heart, earnest, anxious for the right, ready for conciliation and peace. I have found here in these daily labors constant encouragement to believe that universal peace is the only true status for mankind.

But these great gatherings of nations, while they are directly and indirectly productive of important results, are not alone suffi-

cient; there must be everywhere direct agencies employed, the organization of societies, association, local and international action, if we would do away with war. If we would bring about that disarmament of which Dr. Boardman just spoke, we must go about it in an organized and systematic way and not trust to chance, for in this manner the world has drifted for the last six thousand years, and we must now guide the ship into the haven of peace. That can only be done through the instrumentality of organization of many sorts and in every land. I am very glad indeed that we have begun such organization. There should be special organizations in different countries, and then there should be a great international association established somewhere, at some point convenient of access for the world in general, so that its representatives from time to time may assemble and measures be taken to bring about this glorious result at the earliest possible moment.

Disarmament perhaps need not be expected at present. The great nations of the world will not lay down their arms until they have some guarantee that their interests will be protected; so I believe before disarmament shall come there will be established some great tribunal with the concurrence of all civilized nations to which shall be referred questions of difference for settlement in a peaceful manner; it is for this we are struggling and we have signs of its early coming. It is a blessed thing that within recent years there have been so many settlements of international difficulties without war. There have been more difficulties settled in this way than we know, perhaps. When in the midst of the late American war, there was danger of recognition by certain foreign powers, there was another power, a lover of America and unwilling that this Union should be disrupted, which showed her colors in American waters and forbade that intervention which was threatened by other powers, and who knows but that during yet more recent times, in Central and Western Europe, devastating and terrible wars have not been prevented by the belief that other great powers not involved in the controversy would interfere and so far enforce their mandate as to prevent actual war, if once declared? This would indicate that the time is near when no nation can make war upon any other nation without something like the consent of mankind. When that time is reached, there will then be a readiness of all nations to agree upon the establishment of some international tribunal for the arbitration of difficulties between nation and nation.

This recent decision of the Commission in the Behring Sea case is another good omen. Though disappointed, how readily America has acquiesced. There are Americans who believe absolutely that the decision is correct; that the waters to which reference is made in the discussion of the issue are waters that should be open to the other nations of the world. Has there been a case, Mr. Chairman (my memory fails me if there has been a

case), in which the decision by the Court of Arbitration has not been acquiesced in?

THE CHAIRMAN: There has not been a case.

His memory corroborates mine. Acquiescence has been the rule. When you have created a great Court of Arbitration, let it be laid down that in case of a refusal to acquiesce in a decision the ports of the nations should be closed to the one disregarding the decision of the tribunal and that commercial and diplomatic intercourse should be withdrawn and the nation made an outlaw among the nations, and there is not a nation under Heaven that would for an instant entertain the thought of taking such ground as that.

I believe, therefore, in the wisdom and practicability of this great international tribunal to which reference has been made. I believe it the duty of this Congress and of the lovers of peace everywhere, individually and by association, to strive for the early establishment of such a Court, which would result in the utter desuetude of war and the establishing of peace everywhere and evermore.

MRS. AMANDA DEYO: Mr. Chairman—May I add a word? The President, when he introduced the speaker, did not say ex-Governor of what. I know that the heart of every mother and sister will thrill when I tell them that this is that ex-Governor of Wyoming who was not afraid to give woman the ballot and to put her beside man and let her have the power by law to enter upon the same course. Many years ago he took this brave stand confident in heart and mind that he was right. Let women everywhere hear the words of this man, a practical peace man.

GOV. HOYT: I do not want to let this opportunity pass without speaking of the part that woman should have in the establishing of universal peace; woman, last at the cross, first at the resurrection; woman, always and anywhere where good is to be done. This is her field, she is a peacemaker at heart. Let her come to the front and do her work.

DR. TRUEBLOOD then read a paper by Hodgson Pratt on

THE FRATERNAL UNION OF PEOPLES.

(I) INTERNATIONAL ANIMOSITIES AND THEIR CAUSES.

When the present writer visited Buda-Pesth in order to establish an Arbitration and Peace Association, he paid a visit to the Cardinal Archbishop of Hungary,—who, on learning the object of the interview, at once observed: “If you want to get rid of War, you must get rid of the hatreds which lie so deep in men’s hearts.”

There is undoubtedly much truth in the Cardinal’s remark; and, in the former ages of the world’s history, every little tribe was animated by hatred against some other tribe. In due course,

however, a better comprehension of what was demanded by self-interest led the hostile tribes to combine in larger groups, called Nations, and to put some limits to their internecine rivalries. They had discovered that interchange of services and of products were infinitely more advantageous than indulgence in conflict. In fact, men came to learn that trade was more profitable than war.

In the slow course of time, each race or nation on the earth's surface has, owing to a thousand influences, acquired certain qualities of brain and hand which differentiate it from all the others. Each, therefore, needs the others, as the latter need each; until at last there comes that "unity in diversity" which is seen to perfection in a Swiss or American Federation, through which men of many languages, religions and races constitute a harmonious and prosperous community.

Unhappily, the world at large is, as yet, far off from a condition of things like that indicated by such a phrase as the "United States of Europe." In that part of the world's surface which we call Europe, we find nations which claim to be at the head of civilization through the services they have rendered to science and religion, through the grandeur of the events through which they have passed, and through their immense accumulation of wealth. Yet, what a condition of barbarism do they not present, when we observe the fact that their Governments are at this moment devoting their strength and energy, — in order to place twelve millions of armed men in battle-array against each other! Wealth, science, thought and skill are all devoted in a supreme degree to the accomplishment of mutual destruction. The dearest hopes of mankind, its highest aspirations, and its greatest interests, are sacrificed to the object of making a holocaust of men in the prime of life, and the chief producers of the national sustenance.

In the face of an evil so appalling, and so entirely opposed to the moral and material interests of humanity, it becomes our solemn duty to consider all the *Causes* of an evil, so great and universal; it would seem to be the foremost duty of every man who cares one jot for the happiness of the race to consider with all his might how salvation from such wrong and ruin may be obtained.

SOME OF THE CAUSES.

A. The fact must be clearly recognized that Hate, mere blind, unreasoning Hate, plays a larger part than is often admitted. Just as between individuals or families within a community, even when refined and educated, unreasoning antipathy often arises, leading to unimagined folly, injustice or crime, so it is with nations. Facts are often powerless to convince; reason and conscience become paralyzed. At such times, appeals even to self-

interest are not heeded ; and suggestions to “ arbitrate ” are summarily rejected.

B. From the very outset of our school age,—all through the days of our University career,—and then later on in manhood, we are sedulously taught to believe in the essential superiority, moral, intellectual and religious, of our own country. For instance, our education in History is altogether lop-sided ; we are taught far more about every tenth-rate man or every tenth-rate event in our national records than about the very greatest men or events which concern any foreign country. Facts relating to War ; the annexation of other men’s lands ; and the subjection of foreign populations occupy much greater attention than facts relating to the great questions of Philosophy, Religion and Politics, or to Social and Industrial Reform. True nobility and heroism are represented rather as embodied in the soldier than in the reformer, the philanthropist or the statesman.

With such education it becomes impossible to judge impartially respecting the conduct of other nations with whom we come into dispute. The whole tendency of such influences is to make us think that other nations are more likely to be in the wrong, because less noble and more selfish, less truthful and more treacherous, than ourselves. Then, when a serious international quarrel arises, how few of our public instructors in the press are willing or able to present the facts with true impartiality ! Their comments on the controversy, which we as citizens are called to decide, are marked by every sign of prejudice and passion.

C. International animosity has not only its seat in the *moral* causes which we have indicated, but they have their seat also in false *economic* ideas. There has been,—not only the absence of right ethical teaching,—but also the absence of right scientific teaching. Just as, within a community, many persons imagine that the interests of the several classes are antagonistic, so nations also are blind to the fact that in the long-run, their interests are *one*. No one class, or group of traders or producers can benefit by the impoverishment of another. Equally so in the case of nations,—living and prospering, as they do, by interchange of products,—no one people can be really and permanently benefited by the impoverishment, ruin and depletion of another people. Tariff “ wars ” and tariff “ walls ” would never have existed had Governments and Legislatures perceived how necessary all countries are to each other. They have not perceived that it is better to have rich customers than poor ones ; that it is better to produce chiefly what you can produce best ; and to buy from another what you cannot produce, except badly and dearly. In every ship, conveying from one land to another cotton or corn, minerals or timber, raw material or manufactured goods, there is a manifestation of that great inter-dependence of Peoples which an All-Wise and All-Foreseeing Providence designed as a bond of unity among

men. That great law of mutual need, and therefore of complete and constant co-operation, should be impressed on the mind of every citizen as an essential part of his education.

D. Another cause of the fatal and foolish strife between those who were intended for mutual help and service, is the false notion that national prosperity comes chiefly from material power,—from extension of territory,—and from military prestige. How wide is this from the truth! Within any civilized community who is the citizen most truly happy in the esteem and confidence of his fellows, or even the most likely to win a fair competence? He who is trusted and honored, who is known to be animated by a high sense of right and justice;—or the schemer whose motives are seen to be those of blind selfishness, unscrupulous in his acts, so long as he may achieve “success”? The moral law is as absolutely true and universal in its application,—whether it refers to the individual or to the nation. That State, then, which has its records least stained by outrage on the rights of others, by bad faith, cruelty and greed, is the one which finds it most easy to contract favorable agreements, and maintain peaceful relations with other States. It will not be suspected of machinations against the property or independence of other States, and the latter will not prepare arms or intrigue against it. The People which is trusted will have less reason for expending millions in defensive armaments, or for expecting treacherous designs from others;—in a word, its honesty will truly have been its best policy. Who, for instance, would take arms against the peaceful, the unaggressive and honorable Republic of Switzerland? She is strong because she has no troops for aggression; she is strong because, in her relations with her neighbors, she has kept good faith with others.

(II) HOW THE CAUSES OF INTERNATIONAL ANIMOSITY MAY BE REMOVED.

The diagnosis of a disease indicates more or less clearly the nature of the remedy. We now proceed to consider how the Causes of animosity just indicated should be dealt with. Obviously, if the education of men in youth and manhood respecting the mutual duties of States to each other is bad or defective, there must be a reform in the character of that education. It becomes therefore one of the chief tasks of the Peace Societies to bring about a change in this respect. They must put themselves in communication with the educational world, in order that a remedy may be found.

The school-books of the young which relate to international Morality and to History must be re-written. In the field of Ethics, teachers must be trained to lay a true foundation in this respect; and, in History, the main object should be to show that through the ages there has been an increasing conviction that,

for communities as well as for individuals duty is Heaven's first law. In school and college, the growing generation must be taught that only when justice and right have inspired legislation, government, institutions and classes, has there been true progress and true prosperity. They must be taught that the great aim and purpose of man from the beginning is that of "working out the beast." Just in proportion as the individual or national life has been moulded by reason and spiritual law, has a true civilization grown up. From their earliest years, men must be trained to perceive that a resort to *Force* in dealing with others is but a resort to the life of the brute creation. Heroism and patriotism, — the glory of self-sacrifice for a worthy cause, is the greatest lesson for the young; but it must be heroism, unstained by bloodshed, or by the suppression of the weak by the strong. It must be a patriotism which never says "My country,— wrong or right!" — or which takes it for granted that one's country is always in the right. It must be patriotism which seeks, at any sacrifice, to make one's country wiser and nobler,— not merely more powerful or wealthy than another.

The suggestion just made is applicable still more strongly to the higher and later branches of education at the University. The great seats of learning are forming the thoughts and convictions of those who will become the world's leaders; — the judges and administrators of law; the religious teachers; — the thinkers; and the statesmen. Never will justice and right guide the relations of the peoples with each other, so long as the captains of industry, of science, and of government are trained chiefly to admire ideals which are wholly false. It is for this reason that "The International Arbitration and Peace Association" recently offered a prize of fifty pounds for the best Model Chapter on Peace and War, and on international duties, for use in Elementary Schools. It is for this reason, also, that the attention of the Rectors of all Universities is now being drawn to certain practical questions affecting this object. They have been asked to consider how far facilities are or can be given to undergraduates desirous of passing certain of their terms in a foreign University. This is of importance, because of the service to international amity which can be rendered by widely extended association between students of various nationality. The heads of Universities have been further asked to consider how far, in the sphere of International Law, prominent attention can be brought to the subject of international rights and duties, as well as to all modes of settling disputes otherwise than by force. Their attention has also been drawn to the subject of teaching History and political Geography in such a mode as may call the attention of students to services rendered by men of other nations than their own to human progress in all its developments.

In the next place, we have to consider how, and in what manner, the enormous and increasing influence of the press may be exercised on behalf of international amity and unity, rather than on the side of international animosity. Of course, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the main object of a newspaper proprietor is to make his paper sell; and that, consequently, he will choose such writers as are most in touch with the prejudices and passions of the readers. It is, then, rather to the *readers* than to the *proprietors* or *editors* that we must probably address ourselves. We would ask the former then whether they are sufficiently alive to their responsibility, as regards the particular newspapers which they support. It is not a matter of small moment that we should countenance those which seek to trade on men's hatred and ignorance. It is not a trifling matter to support that part of the press which teaches its readers, that a "spirited foreign policy" is the chief thing to be desired by a country in its relations with others; or that the sole question for a nation is to consider what are called its "honor and its interests." We all know what "honor" means in this connection; it is the honor of having one's own claims complied with, unquestioningly. It is the "honor" of getting the better of a rival at any cost and of being strong and victorious;—not of being right or reasonable.

My next suggestion will probably be considered as one coming under the designation of an "unpractical fad." It is this: that newspaper proprietors should enable the readers of their papers to see both sides of international, as of all other subjects, as is done by the best modern Reviews. Under the head of "Open Council," the reader should find fair and full statements of fact and opinion on all sides. In giving the substance of articles from foreign newspapers, they should be far more full and fair, than is generally the case. To present a mere garbled account of a leading article in a foreign newspaper is a fraud upon both nations. Similarly, faithful summaries should be given of parliamentary and other public speeches which have been delivered in foreign countries. We must all try to acquire more of the judicial spirit, and divest ourselves of blind partisanship, if we are to be just in our opinions, and, therefore, in our acts. The first step to injustice is to hear and read only one side of any question. The man who consents to do that, is not a good citizen of his own country or of the world. The supreme duty of honest judgment, based on full and fair study of the facts, is one of the first moral duties, though daily disregarded on the platform, in the council-chamber, and in the newspaper.

Among the many influences which mould men's consciences and, therefore, their actions, is that of the Pulpit. An immense responsibility devolves therefore upon those who undertake to teach the great spiritual laws which underlie human life in all its

phases. Yet, the general indifference of the preachers of Christ's Gospel to the great question of War and international duty, is an undoubted and surprising fact. The essential unity of mankind — the universal law of brotherhood, without distinction of race, — are essential and remarkable features in Jesus Christ's teaching. Yet, on the whole priests and ministers have been silent as to the duties which the different groups of the human family owe to each other. The preachers leave it to be implied that it is their own nation which enjoys, in a special degree, God's favor and protection. Nothing could be more entirely contrary to morality or to truth. During the ten or eleven years that the present writer has been visiting the chief cities of Europe, to promote the cause of Arbitration and Peace, he has visited clergymen of various denominations, — including British Chaplains on the Continent; but he has very seldom received from them any encouragement. Consequently, we may add this to the functions of the peacemakers: — that of arousing the clergy to a sense of their duty in this respect.

As regards the false ideas which prevail as to what constitutes the true prosperity of a nation, we must look to wide and effective teaching among the public at large. When the present writer was a very young man, he had the privilege of listening to those remarkable public addresses of John Bright and Richard Cobden, which aroused the whole country to a noble enthusiasm. It is a significant fact that their economic teaching was indissolubly allied with ethical teaching of a very lofty kind. What gave the orators of "The Anti-Corn Law League" their wonderful power over immense audiences representing all classes of society, was not a mere appeal to material interests. They drew their inspiration, not so much from a desire to increase national wealth, as from a desire for peace between nations, based upon the great law of common needs and of a beneficial fraternity. In every sentence one perceived the spirit of a true morality, — the desire that the peoples should be united and not divided. Nothing has been taught or seen since which invalidates the truth of the doctrines then proclaimed through England, just fifty years ago. Let us consider whether it may not be possible to call into existence everywhere, Leagues which may do for other countries what was done for ours. Look at the astounding success, material though it be, of English industry and commerce! See how Britain's fleets of merchantmen outnumber those of all other countries on every ocean and in every port. That surely is not due to any special qualities belonging exclusively to that people. It is simply due to the adoption of the principle of Free Trade, adopted by them with an intense conviction of its truth. If other nations would equally learn the lesson, they would become so bound together by the ties of common interest, that they would perforce abandon the internecine wickedness called War:

their millions of young and strong workers would give themselves to productive labor instead of passing their best years in the barrack room and on the parade ground. Millions of money would yearly be saved instead of being worse than wasted. Viewed thus, Free Trade is not a mere economic doctrine; it becomes an international policy, based upon the reciprocal necessities of men, and a foundation for unity and brotherhood.

Among the influences which make for Peace is that of democratic or republican forms of government. At the same time, I feel bound to admit that in such States as Great Britain, the wide extension of the suffrage, and the absolute power of Parliament to control legislation and government, provide ample security against the exercise of undue interference on the part either of the Monarch or of the military classes. Bearing in mind such exceptions to the rule, it seems clear that the influence of the working classes makes, on the whole, for Peace. They have no pride in military glories, from which they derive no personal advantage. The interests and demands of labor concentrate the attention of those engaged in it; it matters little to them whether the *prestige* or the so-called "honor" of the country is engaged in some diplomatic dispute; or in a disagreement about far distant territory.

Again, with the great facilities of communication between populations, there is increasing solidarity of opinion and of sympathy between the *proletariat* everywhere, in their battle against the capitalist and employer. Practically, they are laying the foundation for a true international unity. Through greater education, political and otherwise, and through the advance of democratic institutions, their political power grows constantly; and the result on Foreign Affairs in the direction of peace is obvious. Whatever may be done in countries still needing popular government, to give political power to the masses, is therefore to advance the cause of international unity and concord.

On the other hand, it is possible that the majority of the people, however politically free, may fall too much under the influence of professional politicians. These latter may, at a given moment, for mere party purposes, hound on their followers to a policy of vindictiveness or aggression upon a foreign State. The latter may be told that the foreigner with whom they have a dispute,—being monarchical or aristocratic, or a *bourgeois* oligarchy, is animated by a desire to crush them. The masses, not having adequate time or means for a full study of foreign politics, may possibly fall under the sway of such unscrupulous leaders, and be led to War. We must therefore not trust too implicitly to Democracy to secure the blessings of Peace. They can only be secured, so long as national opinion is governed by an enthusiasm for justice and humanity in dealing with other peoples.

Alike under a constitutional Monarchy and under a Republic,

we must plead for a permanent and enlightened control over Foreign Affairs on the part of the people at large. At present, Governments are everywhere left without adequate supervision. They may enter into dangerous and compromising engagements or controversies, which are wholly unknown to the public. Only at the last moment, when it is perhaps too late, are the citizens made aware of the fact of a dangerous international crisis. It may then find itself committed to a conflict which it cannot prevent. In the course of long and only half known communications, angry feelings may have been excited between the two Governments:—passion usurping the place of reason, so that neither will give way. Among the remedies, therefore, against international animosities, there should be in every country a permanent and independent “National Council of Foreign Affairs.” It should be alike independent of the Government (always more or less actuated by party and personal objects), and of the electors, left too much in ignorance of the facts. This Council should be one of a juridical character—consisting mainly of persons experienced in public affairs, and trained in the habits of legal thought—jurists and judges. To this body should be communicated, under a special enactment, every document and communication relating to the relations between the Home country and other States. This body should further have the right to communicate its opinion, when necessary, to the Government, and to call for information required for the discharge of its duty. It should also have the power to lay before the legislative body any information with which it considers the representatives of the people should be made acquainted.

Whenever a serious dispute arises, this Council should have legal authority to formulate a complete statement of the case; and to place itself in communication with any corresponding body existing in the other State. The purpose of such reference would naturally be that of arranging for a conference between the two bodies. By a further enactment of the Constitution, it might be declared that no Government should proceed to hostilities until a statement of the whole case had been drawn up, by the National Council in question, and submitted to the decision of Parliament.

It appears, indeed, quite as reasonable that in a free country the citizen should exercise the same control over Foreign Affairs that he exercises over Home Affairs. In certain cases, the prosperity, nay, the very existence of the country, may depend as much upon the course adopted in the one case as in the other.

The great evil afflicting mankind with which we have tried to deal in this paper, is probably due to many causes of more or less force than those here enumerated; but it would be at variance with the objects of the Congress to consider the less prominent circumstances which occasion international animosity.

I believe that if these above enumerated could be adequately

dealt with, the world would enter on a new chapter in man's history. A new and higher destiny would be opened to the dwellers upon this earth. The sacred laws, upon the observance of which the true welfare of mankind depends, would be more widely observed; and that welfare depends, in the long run, not on material facts alone. It depends as much or more on man's obedience to the moral law; and until he obeys it, in all his relations with his fellows, there can be no escape from the misery and suffering of this world, which have been so great a mystery to the thinkers of all ages.

If man shares the divine nature, if he is made in the image of the Creator, the moral law must and will become supreme on this earth. It is this hope and this belief which has inspired those who have labored in all times and in all lands for the realization of a kingdom of Heaven upon the earth. It is unquestionable that in man's nature there are powers which unite him with God, because they are divine in origin and inspiration. What has to be done is to bring about the necessary development, and the supreme authority of those powers over life and conduct; not in a few exceptional representatives of the race only; but in the whole human family. The supremacy of the law of love and the suppression of the rule of hate, is the ultimate goal of all our efforts.

REV. H. S. CLUBB of Philadelphia then read a paper on

PROPHECIES OF PEACE AND WAR.

One of the chief difficulties with which the peacemaker has to contend and which stands in the way of disarmament is the prevalence of the idea that the inevitable fulfilment of prophecy requires that at least one more great war, or, as some think, a general condition of war shall take place among civilized nations, before the reign of peace can begin.

Not only have we heard this belief stated by those who believe in war as a necessity, but it is whispered by those who are antagonistic to war and believers in arbitration as a substitute therefor, and some of our devoted peace friends even look painfully wise and predict a general European war as inevitable and a necessary precursor of disarmament and peace.

We do not believe in "stoning the prophets," but if any prophets ever required stoning, metaphorically, those who predict an inevitable war which no power on earth or in heaven can prevent, are those prophets. They stand to-day right in the path of progress. They prevent hope of even a partial disarmament, and they are the chief support to those who clamor for large appropriations for military and naval purposes, and so long as they succeed in impressing their dismal predictions upon the public mind, so long will war establishments be maintained

and military and naval appropriations continue to be wrung from the deluded peoples of civilization, impoverishing the many for the enrichment of a few, and keeping the world in dread and fear.

Can any of these prophets tell us why the European nations *must* go to war? Can they point to a single nation that has not already had enough of war? Some, we know, point to the feeling of France against Germany, the result of the last war, and of the forcible detachment of Alsace and Lorraine from French dominion. But if this be likely to bring on another war it is unfortunate for the theory of settling difficulties between nations by the sword. It shows that one war leads to another, and suppose France should win back these provinces by another war, it would simply make Germany as restless as France is now, and another war would still be the bugbear of Europe with which to obtain large appropriations.

The fact is war is not the road to peace. It seldom settles a difficulty. It may quiet a people for a time from the necessity of the situation, but it usually increases rather than diminishes a feeling between nations and the more war is employed to promote peace the longer will the reign of peace be postponed.

When we inquire of these dismal prophets why they believe another terrible war inevitable they sometimes say: "Well there is this eminent divine and that student of prophecy; they all agree that a time of terrible disaster must precede the millennium; 'wars and rumors of wars' are predicted by the prophets and by Christ himself as among the signs of the coming reign of peace." Thus they bring in the Prince of Peace himself as a prophetic witness in behalf of a coming war.

Now, admitting that there are some indications of troublous times in the prophetic words of the prophets of the kingdom and reign of Christ, have we not already passed through enough to fulfil all these terrible predictions? Is it not time to call a halt to this perpetual work of war prediction and preparation? Nearly two thousand years of war and preparation for it with all its direful consequences should surely be enough to satisfy those who insist on the fulfilment of every prediction of disaster.

It must be evident that if the Christian Churches and organizations of religion were to unite in all lands and declare that these prophecies of evil days have been sufficiently fulfilled, and that another war shall not with their consent be declared between any of the Christian nations; that arbitration shall take the place of war; that disputes between Christian nations must from this time be referred to Courts of Arbitration, no government in Europe or America would dare to declare war. If the Christian Churches of Europe and America were to unite on this subject another war would not only not be probable but it would be well nigh impossible.

Already the British Parliament has decided by a unanimous vote in favor of referring all disputes between Great Britain and America to arbitration. Let this motion be sustained by the sentiment of the Churches and it will soon be extended to the relations between other Christian nations.

What we require on the part of all Christian Churches is a belief in the religion of Christ who explained that His servants would not fight because His Kingdom was not of this world.

The sad fact that in most cases the Churches sanction and thereby sustain war and the preparations for it, some Churches having drilling schools in their school-rooms, simply shows how far they have departed from the standard of their Master.

Now we ask that the Churches consider this great subject and see if they cannot take a united stand on behalf of the Christian method of arbitration.

The Lord himself continually set the example of fulfilling prophecy. All admit that the reign of peace is predicted by the most clearly evangelical prophets as a result of the Christian dispensation; all admit that the reign of peace is essential to the establishment of Christ's Kingdom. Now let us follow this high example and do this "that it *may be fulfilled* as spoken by the prophets." Let every Church raise the standard of peaceful arbitration and the power of the Churches will be felt by every government.

We are opposed to this continual prediction of war, too, because it is liable to bring about the evil predicted. War, when not induced by the blunders or design of military or naval officers, is usually the result of public sentiment. If the expectation of another war be continually held by professed students of prophecy, it will do a good deal towards promoting its occurrence. But if this prediction as applicable to the present time, or the near future, be abandoned as an error, and the whole power of persuasion concentrated on the promotion of the Christian methods of Arbitration, with the opening given to the subject in the British Parliament by Mr. Cremer, Sir J. Lubbock and Mr. Gladstone, there is every reason to believe that through the construction of international treaties, arbitration will be relied upon in future and the idea of a war will be superseded by the humane method now practically adopted by the British and American nations.

In taking this view we are simply following the direction of our Lord to His disciples that they preach that "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

We believe the purpose of prophecy is "instruction in righteousness" as St. Paul so well puts it in regard to all Scripture given by inspiration of God.

We also believe that with full faith in the divine purpose of the Lord to establish His peaceful Kingdom on the earth we should

not wait for prophecy to be fulfilled of itself, but cordially unite all believers in the Gospel of Peace in fulfilling it, or as directed by the Divine Spirit, in doing that which will lead to its blessed fulfilment, dissipating the war clouds that have so long oppressed the nations and proclaiming the highest conviction that the time has already come for nations to "learn war no more."

The objects of the Christian Arbitration and Peace Society are: "To promote peace and good will among men; to show the baleful influences of war on all the great interests of mankind; and to promote the final abandonment of war and appeal to physical force, by the amicable settlement of differences between nations, peoples, classes and individuals." The special field of labor chosen by this Society and which is its chief reason for distinctive existence is within the Christian Churches. The purpose is to awaken these Churches to a deeper sense of the importance of peace so as to secure their united effort and testimony so as to exert such an influence on public sentiment and thereby on governments as will lead to the adoption of arbitration in place of war, and a general disarmament of the nations, thereby fulfilling the prophecies of the ultimate success of the Christian Dispensation.

M. LOUISE THOMAS of the City of New York was then introduced and said:

GENTLEMEN AND LADIES — I will detain you but a few moments. As the speakers have told you, the world for more than six thousand years has been filled with the records of war. The glory of nations has been measured by their war power. The greatness of men and their right to perpetuation in the memories of the young have been measured by their powers in war, and nations have reckoned their greatness solely by their victories on the battlefield.

Ideas like this of peace grow, ripen and have their fruit. They have their seedtime and their time for fruitage. In the great reform before us the seedtime has passed; we are now in flowering time of this great theme of a world at peace. I must speak to you as an American full of national hope and pride and joy, as loving all nations and in great harmony with all mankind, for it is my religion that God is truly the father of all, and that all men are brethren.

I have wondered all this summer how it must look to our friends from other lands when they walk the streets of American cities and note the absence of armed men which you see in almost every other nation. They see men at their business, they see them walking the streets, and they note the general prosperity of the people, and yet see no armed men standing as a menace before the nations of the world.

This thought has been pressed upon me because of emotions

which entered my heart in other lands. A year ago last spring I had the honor to be sent to Russia and visit the people and note their condition. I saw the grandeur and beauty of the two great cities St. Petersburg and Moscow, and then passed directly down into the depths of famine, starvation, disease and death. I went determined to take no part in the political life of that great nation. I could not help loving the people. They are very kind. They are the most lovable people on earth. I make no exception; as a people, they stand head and shoulders above all other people in their natural kindness — but I could not shut my eyes to the evils of the government.

Every man, when he reaches the age of eighteen, is conscripted into the army. It is the law: he must go into the army and serve there a number of years. Before he goes, at eighteen, he must marry. That is also the law. He is bidden to take himself a young wife. He goes from his home leaving his wife behind him and he remains three years or more. He learns nothing of business — the country has his services as of all young men. He comes home totally uneducated. He has learned idleness and to drink that horrible liquor in use everywhere in the country. No village or town says, "we will not have vodka shops." The government says they must stand because the government gets an income from them. The young men are trained to war and know nothing else. They drink vodka away from home and they come home and drink it — if their wives drink it also, who shall wonder? So we have in that mighty nation a million and a half of soldiers. You see men who you might say were born to the saddle; men who seem to be a part of their horses — it is wonderfully interesting to an American who never saw such a sight. It is thrilling to look at men in whose faces you can see nothing but simply the brute instinct, to fight. They know nothing else; it is what they were born for.

During my visit it was my good fortune to make the acquaintance of Count Tolstoi whose name is known everywhere. You who read Count Tolstoi's book can not comprehend its true depth and meaning unless you have studied the conditions around him. It requires great moral courage and a great uplifting of Christian faith to meet the sacrifices made by Count Tolstoi on account of his utterances. He sits, in a sense, alone in imperial Russia. He is greatly under suspicion of the police, but the reputation he has made abroad is also his great protection. That the people of the world and especially the people of America have learned to know and appreciate Count Tolstoi gives him great influence and renders him free from arrest, for the present.

He said he considered the American the most perfect government the world has ever seen. "But why call it a government at all when the people govern themselves? If a law is bad, they can well afford to wait until the time comes when they may change

it. Men may talk truly about the evils around them and fear nought. They may even publish their thoughts without restriction." There is no such thing as freedom of the press in Russia. Never a letter written by any stranger can go out of the Empire without being opened by the censors and examined, and no letter can come in without the same examination. No paper can be delivered from any of our cities without careful examination and it has been a sorrow to me, because in our grand papers there is so much that I would like to send to Count Tolstoi and others, but I dare not do it, because in every paper there is something that would vitiate the whole.

When we were about to part I said to Count Tolstoi: "What message shall I carry to America from you, to the people who love you?" He pondered an instant. I said: "May I tell them you hope to come to America next summer, to see us?" "Yes," he said, his face lighting up, "you may tell them that, that is what I would like to do; but not to stop in New York, I would like to stay with your farmers in their homes. I would like to see how they cultivate the soil. I would like to see your common people. I would like to learn the influences that have gone to build up a country like America."

Discussion of the subject of war in Russia is impossible. I never said one word concerning it, or concerning the vodka shops, but stored it in my own mind to bring home.

My duty called me to leave Russia to attend a Convention to which I was a delegate and I had the great pleasure of a personal interview with King Leopold. He was very kind and treated me with distinguished courtesy, calling me the "American lady," as they had in Russia, the proudest title any woman on earth can receive. The King said: "It is the regret of my life that I have never been to America." I said: "Your Majesty will never know how many friends you have until you do come." He laughed and said: "You are very kind." I said: "We hope you will come to our Exposition next year." He said: "What can we do, ours is a little country, yours is great and rich and prosperous. You are building up a great and wonderful nation. I look with much interest to see what you are doing and the influences going to build up this great people." I said: "Your Majesty, it is the common people of America that are framing and forming the country."

I wish I could have the time to draw the contrast between war and peace, for, Gentlemen and Ladies, I count ours a peace nation. Our twenty-five thousand soldiers are merely a police force to guard our frontiers. It is true we have some "fuss and feathers" in the army. It is true we have our iron-clads built ready for action, but no sensible man or woman supposes for one moment they will ever be used. I do not think it. In that great review in New York harbor in May those iron-clads finely bedecked and

officered were not one of them soiled by action in war ; they were clean, and God grant they may never be used. I believe war is ended. In Germany no man wants war. In France they say : " You in America will never want war. You have no enemies. You are a great people."

Now, Gentlemen and Ladies, what took me to Russia was to accompany the gift of the American people to the starving in Russia, a Christian act of brotherhood declaring that the American people and the Russian people are friends and brethren.

THOMAS WRIGHT of Birmingham, England, was introduced and said :

I won't occupy much time, but as an old peace friend of forty years' standing I know the peace feeling of England. I have distinct views of man's duty whether as a Christian or a humanitarian. Some of the best friends of peace I have found are, I am sorry to say, disbelievers in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

I am a believer, and I believe the prophecies of peace. We should try to bring about peace by individual efforts, and by peace societies. Clergymen and laymen should preach peace and pray from Sunday to Sunday. So far as I can see, I am sorry to say they do but little of it. It is the same with nations. I may be mistaken in reference to the future, but since it is my opinion, I venture to express it. I can't see sufficient advance yet among the people of the various nations who interest themselves in these great questions. We are only a few ; many who ought to help us do not ; still we must do our duty. If these forget us, they will be guilty if those gigantic guns we heard of the other day are to be used. Look at the state of the world generally ; not only the ignorant masses, but also the refined and cultured people speak lightly of peace. It is very discouraging when we look at the great standing armies. Look at France and Germany ! Look at France's demands on Siam ! Would France have made such demands upon a strong power ? No. Look at the things my country (England) has done in reference to Burmah ! If Burmah were a strong power would England have done these things ? No. And what enlisted her sympathy in the Crimea ? There is no man now who dare stand on the platform and say that that was a righteous war. Did anything come of it ? No, even the treaties are " done up."

I am thankful to say, having attained the age I have, that my heart is in sympathy with John Bright and Richard Cobden. It is a pleasure to come four thousand miles to attend a Peace Congress in this wonderful country. I know the old countries cannot hold their own if they go into a great war, but you are impregnable and have a great future. I have always been an admirer of America. In England, as in America, I hope we shall set a good example and teach the true principles of Christianity. Still we must not be too confident. I wish I could believe in the future,

but when I look at France, Russia and Germany I am discouraged. I know it is the duty of every man who has sympathy to work. As I was coming over in the ship a sailor fell overboard. There was great excitement, a boat was put down and after ten minutes' anxious looking and deep sympathy the boat was seen to come back; you could not tell whether the man was alive or dead; as a matter of fact he was dead. I observed half a dozen anxious faces. Five minutes afterwards it all seemed to be forgotten. Then on the way to Colorado the train pulled up, a man fell off and was picked up killed. Five minutes after it was all over, all sympathy was gone.

What we want is more sympathy, man with man, heart with heart, nation with nation. When we have that, you will see more nearly carried out the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the gospel of peace and human brotherhood.

The report of the International Peace Bureau on the subject of nationalities was then presented. The following proposed resolutions state the conclusions arrived at by the Bureau, after a careful examination of the various propositions referred to it by the fourth Congress.

I.

Whereas neither language, nor race, nor tradition, taken separately, constitute nationality, since each of these is one of the elements which may enter into it;

Whereas, in fact, there are populations of the same language or of the same race, or others placed for a long time under the same yoke who claim to be of different nationalities, and, on the contrary, populations speaking different languages, composed of different races and having different traditions who form, harmoniously, a single nationality;

The Congress, for these reasons, considers that the only undeniable element of nationality is the free and continuous consent of those interested.

The principle of nationality is therefore by its very nature incapable of precise determination; it must, at any rate, be harmonized with the general and superior interests of humanity.

Nationalism being of this nature, the work of the friends of peace should be, above all, to keep it within its just limits when it tends to surpass them, and in the case of conflicts already existing to seek solutions in harmony with the following principles:

Peoples have the undeniable and imprescriptible right of freely disposing of themselves;

The autonomy of every nation is inviolable;

The right of conquest does not exist;

In the States composed of different nationalities and as long as these nationalities do not otherwise dispose of themselves, the Governments can assist in securing external and internal peace by respecting, after the example of Switzerland, the ethnographic character and the development of these nationalities in accordance with the laws of liberty and justice.

II.

The fundamental and indispensable condition of peace between peoples is that no nationality be injured in its natural and imprescriptible rights.

One of the greatest duties of the Peace Societies consists in elucidating the questions concerning nationalities, in order to find just and rational solutions and to impress, in a clear and peaceful way, these solutions upon the conscience of peoples and the spirit of Governments.

The Congress, therefore, expresses the wish:

1. That the members of the Interparliamentary Conference may co-operate in organizing meetings of representatives of different countries, for the study of all international questions liable to disturb peace;

2. That, further, a Committee composed of a large number of members of the Peace Societies may be formed, with the duty of inquiring into grave events which might occasion war, of proposing and taking measures to prevent the causes of difference from being aggravated to the point of rendering war immediately probable.

The meeting was then adjourned.

NINTH SESSION.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 18TH, 3 P. M.

The delegates to the Congress from the Peace Societies met in special business session at 3 P.M. Friday, August 18.

Mr. James Wood, of Mount Kisco, N. Y., was called to the Chair.

The subjects to be considered were as follows :

1. Time and place of the next Peace Congress.
2. Peace propaganda in the schools, in the press, etc.
3. Representation of Peace Societies in the Peace Congresses.
4. Universal Peace petition.
5. Propositions with reference to disarmament and conversion of armies into instruments of industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first subject to be taken up is the time and place of the next Peace Congress.

A motion was made that the next Congress be held in Europe and that the following be appointed a committee to determine the time and place :

Benjamin F. Trueblood, of Boston ; Alfred H. Love, of Philadelphia ; Dr. W. E. Darby and Hodgson Pratt, of London ; Baroness Von Suttner, of Vienna ; Fredrik Bajer, of Copenhagen ; Frédéric Passy, of Paris ; E. T. Moneta, of Italy ; Elie Ducommun, of Berne.

It was proposed that the name of Lady Somerset be added to the committee.

DR. DARBY: We should be delighted to see Lady Henry Somerset on this committee, but her hands are full in connection with another very large organization and she knows nothing about our Peace Congress movement or about the proper working of the peace propaganda.

MRS. MEYER, of Denmark: The enlightened work of American women leads me to ask that they be recognized by the placing of at least one of them upon this committee.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: We do not make any distinctions of sex. The Baroness Von Suttner is on the list and I should be willing to give way to any American lady whom it is thought best to put on. There has been no intention to leave ladies off and put men on.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the nominations are most excellent. I have had the pleasure of meeting each of these individuals, except the Baroness von Suttner, in Peace Con-

gresses in London, Rome and elsewhere. No better selections would be possible.

DR. RICHTER, of Germany: As one of the members of the Peace Bureau I want to state that the Bureau makes a proposal to the Congress to leave it to the Bureau to fix the time and place where the next Congress shall be. Generally hitherto we have had the Congress in connection with the Parliamentary Conference and we always want to have it so. This year the Parliamentary Conference was to have been held in Christiania, Norway, but certain circumstances came on to prevent it from being there. The elections in Norway and in Germany have thrown into disorder all that was fixed previously. I do not think it necessary to have a committee appointed now, because it was understood in the Congress last year that the Permanent Bureau at Berne should make the arrangement, in connection with the Peace Societies, as to what city the next Congress should be held in. It has been so hitherto and I believe it ought to be so in time to come.

DR. DARBY: Perhaps I shall expedite the business if I briefly reply to Dr. Richter. The Bureau at Berne has not hitherto arranged for the Congress, for the simple reason that it has not been in existence to make the preparations. What has been done is this: An invitation has been sent to the sitting Congress which has itself determined where the next Congress should meet. This is an arrangement for the Congress to make for itself, and the Congress is represented by a great variety of constituent elements. We are anxious, of course, that our Congresses shall be successful, that the annual meetings of the representatives of the Peace Societies shall be so arranged as to gather the representation of all Societies and secure the sympathy and co-operation of them all. In selecting this committee to fix the time and place of the next Congress, we are making provision for doing what the Congress here to-day is not in a position to do, because it has had no invitation before it. You simply propose that the meeting shall be held in Europe next year, that these persons shall determine the question when and where the Congress shall be held and by whom the arrangement shall be made. You may be quite sure that the committee, if appointed, will take into consideration all that my friend Dr. Richter has intimated, namely, the holding of the Interparliamentary Conference, and everything else that would come within its purview.

The motion prevailed and the committee was chosen, as proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: We next ask your consideration of the subject of representation of the Peace Societies in the Peace Congresses.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: This question was left over from the Congress last year and entrusted to the Berne Bureau to study during the

year and make report at this time. It is certainly proper for this Congress to consider what the Bureau have given us. There have been two or three discussions on the subject in previous Congresses and no decision has ever been reached.

This is the proposition which the Bureau makes :

1. The Universal Peace Congresses are composed: (1) of delegates of the Peace Societies or of adhering public institutions; (2) of adhering Societies whose primary aim is not peace; (3) of adhering members.

2. Every Peace Society and every adhering public institution has the right to be represented in the Peace Congresses by one delegate having the right to speak and vote, if word has been sent to the Bureau before the opening of the Congress.

3. Every Peace Society has the right to one vote for every fifty of its members, or fraction thereof, as declared by its President, but no Society shall have more than five votes.

4. Each Society shall make a contribution of ten francs to the expenses of the Congress, for every vote.

5. Every individual who is a member of a Peace Society and every adhering Society not having Peace as its primary aim may be enrolled as members of the Congress, but only with the right to speak.

The Committee of Organization of the Congress may demand of each one of them a contribution, if necessary, but not to exceed ten francs.

6. No person in the Congress shall represent more than ten votes.

7. The public is admitted to the Congresses, as far as possible, but without the right to speak or vote.

8. The verification of credentials is made before the opening of the Congress. Every legitimate delegate shall receive an entrance card the color of which shall indicate the number of votes which he represents.

Two views have been expressed in reference to this matter, first, that the Peace Societies be left absolutely free to determine the number of delegates they shall send and, second, that the Congresses ought to be limited to a definite number of delegates from each of the Societies. No conclusion has ever been reached, so I present this report of the Berne Bureau, as desired by the Congress last year.

A MEMBER: Will you allow me to ask how many different societies are represented in the present Congress?

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I have not the list of registration, but I suppose there are twenty-five or thirty societies represented, perhaps more.

DR. DARBY: We meet in America, a long way from the great centre of peace activity in Europe. The majority of the Peace Societies represented in the Congresses are on the other side of the water, and I suggest that you refer this matter to the Societies. This Congress has no legislative power for the Peace Societies, and I think a resolution something like this will meet the case, that

the Congress thanks the Bureau at Berne for its labor in the study of the question and the preparation of this report for its consideration, and that the question be referred to the Peace Societies themselves during the coming year, for their consideration, and that these Societies shall be asked to report their views and decisions to the Bureau at Berne with the view of the introduction of the question at the next Congress.

MR. LOVE: I rise to second that motion. I think it a very fair and proper one. The Peace Societies are very much interested in the representation and nothing will suffer by delay in this matter, but a great deal will be gained. It will interest the various Peace Societies to consider this measure and the more we become interested in the work of this kind, the better. I think that Dr. Darby has been very happy in the presentation of this resolution and I cordially second it.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I think I approve, on the whole, of the course proposed of consulting the Peace Societies themselves. There are now, I suppose, two hundred Peace Societies in the world, if I remember correctly. They have never been consulted about this matter. I suppose half of these Peace Societies have never been represented in one of the Congresses until the present. At least, a large number of our American Societies have not been represented, and this question is absolutely new to them. If it is referred to the Societies, it is probable that the Berne Bureau will print a circular and send it to all the Peace Societies in the world asking their opinion. Although I shall vote for Dr. Darby's resolution, I should have preferred to have simply a resolution that no action be taken on the subject, because I am opposed to any action limiting the number of delegates. Whenever you make a rule saying how many delegates any Society shall send to the Peace Congress, you will, in my judgment, have destroyed much of the popular value of this great Universal Peace Congress.

MRS. LOCKWOOD: It might not be amiss to say that the paper from which Mr. Trueblood has translated has been sent to every Peace Society in this country and in Europe of which the Bureau has cognizance, and if any Peace Society, represented here, which has not already done so, will pay the dues in connection with the Bureau it will then get everything that is sent out by the Bureau.

DR. DARBY: I must point out that this is a matter for the Peace Societies to decide and not the Bureau or any single society. I have made my proposition in order that the Peace Societies may be consulted, and if they see fit to surrender their freedom, that they may do so after due deliberation. This matter will be considered and decided, and I am anxious to have a decision reached that will be satisfactory. I do not think it will be the best way for us to say we take no action, because that will leave the matter where it is.

MR. MILLER, of Indiana: If this Congress is not to make laws to govern itself, whence does it derive the rules and laws that govern it?

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Let me, Mr. Chairman, answer the question of Mr. Miller. Heretofore delegates have been sent to the Congresses by the Peace Societies, when the Committee of Arrangements have sent out invitations to them. Those delegates have met and the first thing that has been done has been the appointment of a Business Committee and the adoption of rules of procedure and regulations for the Congress. That is, each Congress has made a constitution for itself, for the time being. The only reason we did not do that this year is that we are acting under the World's Congress Auxiliary. They are largely paying our bills for us and entertaining us in their halls and we have submitted to their regulations. The World's Congress Auxiliary appointed the President and Secretary of this Congress, and we have accepted because of the great courtesies of the Auxiliary, but ordinarily we should have appointed our own President and Secretary and made our own rules of procedure. When this Congress adjourns, it will cease to exist. It is a Congress for one year only. It makes certain resolutions with regard to time and place for holding the next Congress, simply as an expression of opinion. It depends entirely on the Peace Societies whether another Congress shall be held.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: We have voted to refer this matter to the Societies. What means shall we adopt for doing this?

DR. DARBY: The resolution was meant to be that the Congress request the Bureau at Berne to communicate with the Peace Societies, in order to learn their wishes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has now no difficulty in understanding the proposition. As originally stated it was that we referred it to the Bureau at Berne. Now the resolution is that the Bureau be requested to communicate with the Peace Societies upon this subject.

DR. TRUEBLOOD; I would use the word "consult," to consult the Peace Societies as to their wishes in regard to this project.

MR. PERRY: Let me ask if the Peace Societies are known to the Bureau at Berne?

DR. TRUEBLOOD: The European Peace Societies are all known to the Bureau and also the American Societies which have anything like a national character. We are getting as rapidly as possible a complete list to publish in our papers that go regularly to the Bureau, so that there will be no difficulty in the Bureau getting the names.

The resolution was adopted, in its corrected form.

THE CHAIRMAN: The fourth subject to claim your attention is that of the Universal Peace Petition.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: This subject was put on the program because we thought it might be of interest to this Congress to know something about the progress of the carrying out of the proposition made at Berne last year and voted to have a universal peace petition in the various countries of the world, in behalf of peace and arbitration. This has been so successful in one or two countries of Europe that I thought it might be interesting to have a general report of it here. I think, under the circumstances, it would be well to ask Madam Meyer of Denmark and Dr. Darby of England, the two countries in which the petition has been most successful, to tell us a little about it in their own country.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will ask Madame Meyer to give us some account of the petition in Denmark.

MADAM MEYER: After Fredrik Bajer came home from the last Congress he communicated with all the Peace Societies in Denmark and with others about an address to the King. Our Government is very much opposed to the peace work. The King and the Upper House took thirty million dollars out of the treasury about ten years ago to build fortifications, after the Lower House had defied the King and the Upper House. The King dissolved the Parliament, and under a paragraph in our Constitution which says that after Parliament is dissolved the King is authorized to make a provisory financial law, this money was taken. It was one continuous dissolution of the Parliament and using the provisory financial law. So you can see under what difficult conditions the peace people in our country have to work. But notwithstanding that, Fredrik Bajer, Johanna Meyer and all the other leaders of the peace people set to work and the whole country was canvassed and signatures were taken all over the country. The teachers of the schools were requested to bring the question to the children and through the children to the parents, and such a propaganda was made that one-tenth of the nation, about three hundred thousand, signed that address. Permission was asked of the King that it be presented to him, which, after a week or so, was granted and the petition was delivered to him, and he could only say that he himself wanted peace and loved peace, but he said a small country like Denmark must wait until larger countries said what they thought about it. Switzerland is a proof that this is not necessary; but we must remember that there is a great deal that keeps a King back, no matter what his personal wish is. The whole aristocracy is based on war and militarism and the King is relying on them, so that was all he could say. The peace people rejoice that they got the petition in in so good shape and that it was accepted as it was.

THE CHAIRMAN : The Chair will now call on Dr. Darby.

DR. DARBY : I did not know that a special report from England would be required, and I shall have to fish up the facts from memory and give them to you as best I can. The difficulty on the other side of the water, as Madam Meyer has pointed out, is that the ruling classes, which we have not got rid of yet, are all on the side of military organizations and our legislators do not come to the discussion of this question with free and open minds. We have the traditions of the past. We only yesterday grew out of the old feudal system and there are some remnants of it still. The aristocracy, as Madam Meyer says, are interested in the maintenance of the military system, and, therefore, whatever we do, we have to do in the face of immense opposition. Consequently, we have to petition. We do not go to the King in our country. We have outgrown that already.* Judging from the character given to our sovereign in some post-prandial addresses and toasts the greatest commendation of the British sovereign is that she does not interfere at all in politics. We have almost as much popular government in England as you have in America. Our House of Commons is the supreme authority. The influence of the aristocracy is great and wherever you have royalty of any description you have the classes surrounding the Court and the members of that society will have to live somehow and you cannot wonder if they tell us it is beneath the dignity of the gentleman to soil his hands with labor or with commerce, although he may stain them with blood. The military profession is the profession of the gentleman.

We decided not to petition on the general aspect of the question, but inasmuch as a very particular phase of the peace question was before the country, in connection with the invitation given to the civilized nations of the world by the Government of the United States to sign the form of treaty which had been recommended by your Pan-American Conference of Washington, it was concluded to make that the point of our petition. The matter was entrusted to the Secretaries of the two Peace Societies, Mr. Frederick Green of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, and myself. We issued 20,000 forms of petition and sent them to our representatives and secretaries of local societies and helpers all through the country. The question was thus brought before the constituencies of the land, and while I say, ladies and gentlemen, that the British House of Commons is the governing power, I want you also to remember that behind the British House of Commons are the constituencies of the country. The Legislature will do absolutely nothing for us until we can get the people to say "you

* Mr. Fredrik Bajer informs us that the petition in Denmark, as originally drawn, was "To The Government and Parliament." Mr. Bajer holds republican views and is in no way responsible for the change afterwards made in the direction of the address.

must," and then they do what we ask either grudgingly or with more generosity according to the complexion of the particular cabinet that may be in office at Westminster. We issued 20,000 forms of invitation with the result that about 80,000 signatures were actually appended, and many of the persons who thus signed the petition were amongst the most influential people of the different localities. We stood behind Mr. Cremer in his movement in the House of Commons to resuscitate the matter of the invitation coming from this country so that the motion which he had given notice of had the sympathy of the Prime Minister, so much so that he proposed an amendment making Mr. Cremer's motion a little stronger and a little more practical, and when the motion came to a vote in the House it was found that the two great historical parties and the other sections were perfectly unanimous in the support of the proposal; and the British House of Commons has pledged itself with perfect unanimity to co-operate with the Government of the United States in framing a permanent treaty of arbitration. (Applause.)

This is the result of our petition. There were bodies that petitioned and if you take the constituencies represented by those bodies, the total number of persons petitioning in favor of Mr. Cremer's motion I think amounted to about two million.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: I think there has been a little work in Sweden in the way of a petition.

THE CHAIRMAN: The conference will be glad to hear from Dr. Mueller, of Sweden.

DR. MUELLER: I want to confirm what has been stated by Dr. Darby and our friend Mrs. Meyer of their countries, as applying to Sweden, namely, that the people of America have much more elbow room, politically speaking, than we have. We are hemmed in on every side in the old country and with our best wishes we can do comparatively little.

The King of Sweden is considered one of the most enlightened monarchs in Europe. He can deliver speeches in Latin, French, German and English. As to the peace movement, he is far from the mark where we would like to have him, but when asked if he is a friend of peace he says he is, most emphatically. So they are all in favor of peace, as Bismarck used to be and the Emperor William. They are all in favor of peace in theory, but not in practice.

Sweden is a poor country and it is difficult to obtain money there, but when some new gun is to be introduced, some breach loader or some new cannon from Krupp's great factory there is plenty of money. For the peace movement you have nothing, not five cents.

I may add that the Ministers of the Gospel, those of the State church, are not friends of peace. The dissenters, the Methodists,

Baptists, Presbyterians and all the denominations of the dissenters are in favor of the peace movement.

To come to the point, we have had an immense amount of difficulty in working here and there, but the committee have been sending out petitions and I have myself circulated forty-nine lists. The number of names we have collected I am not able to give, for the reason that the time for the collecting of the names has not yet expired. That will be some time in September. They have said in Stockholm that we shall not be behind Denmark, because there is a little pleasant rivalry in this respect.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: In most of the countries of Europe, nothing has yet been done in the execution of the resolution of last year. Really there is no necessity of our taking any action on this subject, unless we think fit to make a resolution of encouragement. I do not know that that is necessary as we have it already included in one of our general resolutions to be offered to-morrow.

Austria has not yet done anything on this subject. In Italy the friends of peace are feeling their way and trying to learn what to do. In France they have already issued their appeal to the people. That appeal was signed by Mr. Frédéric Passy, Jules Simon and a number of other eminent Frenchmen. What they have done in the way of collecting names, I do not know.

It was thought best by the Peace Societies in this country not to undertake any petition at this time, because our Congress has already taken the very steps which these petitions are intended to get the Parliaments of the nations to take. Our Government stands pledged practically to enter into negotiations for arbitration treaties and so we have thought it unnecessary to undertake any petition at present.

MRS. LOCKWOOD: As I represent the International League of Peace and the Bernese Peace Society, I desire to say that in Switzerland the Peace Societies are organized in every Canton and meetings have been called and these petitions circulated and thousands of names were gathered in as early as the 30th of March. I have not with me the exact number of names secured, but the whole country is being canvassed.

MR. LOVE: There is something very fascinating and inspiring about this universal petition proposition. We have heard from Sweden and Denmark and England, but not enough from America on this subject. We have in this country the right of petition. You remember how John Quincy Adams stood for that right many years ago, and how it has told in all these years since his administration. It is one step further than the right of appeal. There is another step that I want our friends always to hold to in this work of reform, and that is that we not only appeal and petition but that we demand as a right. Put behind your petitions a strong appeal for the right and you will find that you will gain by

it. When we met with President Hayes on this subject years ago, after hearing our petition all through, he said to us, "go a little further, get an appropriation for a commission to go abroad and present this subject to the Crowned Heads of Europe, and bring it to me and I will do the needful." When we met with President Grant on the same subject, he said, "continue to petition and appeal and demand an International Court of Arbitration for the settlement of difficulties instead of the arbitrament of war." So I have felt all along in this work that we should petition and appeal and demand.

Here in America we have fortunately the opportunity of appealing privately and collectively to our Representatives in Congress, so that we have opportunities in our homes and in our different walks of life, and we can so mould the governing power of our age and our country that if we will be as faithful and as vigilant as we ought to be we will gain our end.

MRS. DEYO: I would say that after the Berne Peace Congress those petitions were sent me and I had quite a number of copies of them printed and began to circulate them to do missionary work with in my own State of Pennsylvania, and they have been signed by all classes. We ought to have an appropriation from the Government to carry on this work, but they would rather give millions of dollars for war vessels than a few thousand dollars to advance these peace measures.

MR. MILLER: I think we ought to petition the Government for the establishment of a peace department to be one of the departments of the Government.

MR. J. R. PRICE: I have had some experience with the petitions. I went to five hundred different persons, and not a single one of them refused to sign; they were all anxious to sign. I do not think you could find fifty in Chicago unwilling to sign. It is a waste of time and paper, it seems to me, to be getting up the petition. If our Congressmen understood that the people, every one of them, are in favor of this, we should have no difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the subject of Peace Propaganda in the schools, in the press, etc.

DR. TRUEBLOOD; This subject was referred to the Berne Bureau by the Congress last year with the understanding that the Bureau should make a report on it at this time.

The Bureau makes the following recommendation with regard to propaganda in the press.

"We propose that the question of propaganda in the press be taken out of the order of the day of the Universal Peace Congresses, to be taken up again when the financial conditions of the International Bureau shall be improved."

This leaves the work of peace propaganda in the press to the Peace Societies and to individuals just as it has been heretofore.

As to peace propaganda in the schools, the Bureau submits a report which encourages the teaching of children in the way so often alluded to during this and preceding congresses. The report says that no definite response has yet been received to the circular sent out by the Bureau calling the attention of the Ministers of Public Instruction to the resolutions passed on this subject by former Peace Congresses. The Bureau sums up its conclusions in the following resolutions offered for the action of this Congress :

1. The Congress calls the attention of governments and of the directors of public or private instruction, as well as of the Peace Societies and the friends of peace, to a model chapter for the use of primary schools, upon peace and war and kindred questions, a work which is printed in English and in French and for which the International Arbitration and Peace Association as the result of a contest, awarded the author, Mr. Sève, a teacher in France, a prize of \$250.

2. The International Peace Bureau is instructed to draw up a list of works of school history which give to the political, social, artistic and scientific development of different peoples at least as great an importance as to their warlike activity.

3. The International Bureau is instructed to prepare for the Peace Societies a work setting forth some examples of international arbitration and giving as complete a list as possible of such arbitrations.

ALFRED H. LOVE: I feel a deep interest in this subject and I will give you the benefit of my thought, and that is that the study of arbitration should be introduced as one of the sciences. There is in it so much that will at once occur to you. It is not only the laws and languages of nations, not only the climate and the character of the people, but commercial relations and religion as well that we have to study. All these we must study if we would know how to make a better condition of things between nations and be ready to arbitrate difficulties when they occur. In school matters we have for a long time given medals and prizes for good scholarship. Instead of that let the head of every class be considered one of a committee of arbitration and when difficulties occur in school life which we all know will, among the boys, and even among the girls, instead of trotting up to the master or mistress and complaining, let them be referred to that committee that you have already in your school. Appoint the committee on arbitration as a reward for proficiency and good behavior, and when a case arises for adjustment let the committee retire to one of the class rooms and talk it over and in that way they will school themselves to be arbitrators. We have introduced it in New Jersey in a school of considerable importance and it has answered exceedingly well. If they have any difficulties they settle them very easily. This goes out into trades and into business, and in our city of Philadelphia, the greatest manufacturing city on this continent, we have such frequent difficulties in the manufacturing districts that we find the introduction of this as an educational measure among the working classes a very excellent thing.

I think Governor Hoyt to-day gave us a new thought, that it

would be an excellent idea to have upon the staff of each of our papers a man devoted to peace. I think our papers in Philadelphia would adopt that idea. I think George W. Childs of the *Public Ledger* will introduce it, for he has already given volumes of talk to this subject of arbitration. In that way, we have struck the keynote of making the conditions of society such that we would grow naturally into the condition of arbitrating our difficulties. Our change from disarmament to arbitration and from war to peace will not come very suddenly. It will come gradually as the people are ready to receive it, and the way to have them receive it is to begin in our child life, not only in our homes but in the school.

Mrs. LOCKWOOD: Just a thought on that line, which Mr. Love did not touch. What we want and what the Peace Bureau want is to introduce into the colleges and universities of the country and into their text-books matter upon peace as well as upon war. I have corresponded with a number of college Presidents upon this point, and I think what they need is to be consulted with about it. I spoke to the President of my own Alma Mater, and I said that when I was in school they had eleven and a half chapters on war and only half a chapter on peace, and in order that the Bureau at Berne might have communication with the colleges of this country I put them into communication with the educational department at Washington and sent over the entire report of the educational bureau of all the colleges and universities of this country.

MR. FITZGERALD, of Grand Rapids, Michigan: I came to this Congress for this particular subject, being connected somewhat with educational subjects in Michigan. The peace work in Michigan has been conducted something after this mode: starting with the fundamental idea of gentleness and ruling by love in the kindergarten we carry it through if we can to the university. There are in the United States 25,000 public school teachers that we ought to get interested in this work. Looking over this assembly I have seen people taking notes. I hope when they go back to their homes they will look after the superintendents of their schools and see that the supplemental reading which is used in the 8th and 9th grades shall treat of this subject, so that the child nature may be developed on the line of peace and not on the line of war.

DR. AMOS PERRY: Yesterday I visited what is called the children's building in the Fair grounds and what did I see? The building was filled with people and there was a regular drill with deadly weapons. I was shocked to see that training on those grounds.

MR. FITZGERALD: I tried to stop that very thing a year ago, but I could not do it. Some of our churches have regular drills in which the children are instructed and they are helping to culti-

vate the military spirit. Some of our institutions of learning have regular drilling in military training.

DANIEL HILL, of Richmond, Indiana: I think this subject of peace propaganda is exceedingly important. It is a fact, I believe, that however grand a truth it may be and however much it may be in harmony with the general interest of mankind it will not propagate itself. There must be a sower to sow. Jesus told his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and not only should this peace literature go into the schools but it should be brought into the Sabbath-schools and taught to the children. We have now, through the peace department of the W. C. T. U., the grandest opportunity that we have had in the history of the world to put these things into the hands of the children. I wish we could devise some means of inspiring the poets to write peace songs. You know that the deeds of the warrior have been sung by the poets from time immemorial, but we have the grandest theme now to inspire the poets, it seems to me, in this glorious subject of peace, with its moral heroism, and we ought to induce them to write songs that will go into the hands of the people and be sent throughout the country. I believe that if to-day there was an agreement between all the nations of the earth to settle their difficulties by arbitration, still the propagation of peace would be a duty which Christians owe to their master and to the world.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a very interesting discussion and a very important one indeed. The Business Committee will bring forward, doubtless, a suitable resolution on the subject. We will now take into consideration the fifth proposition offered with reference to disarmament and the conversion of armies into instruments of industry.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: Madame Griess-Traut of Paris who was one of the organizers of the Paris Peace Congress in 1889 has sent to us arguments and reasons for the conversion of destructive armies into productive armies. As our program is already so full, I propose that her paper be turned over to the Committee, that it may be properly translated and the substance of it incorporated in our Report.

A motion prevailed that the Committee incorporate the whole or a part of the paper, as they may see fit, in the Report of the Proceedings of the Congress.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: There is a proposition from Mr. Landis of Italy, with regard to an organization of the work of the universal peace petition in Europe. He proposes a chief committee in Italy and sub-committees in all the countries of Europe. As the work of the peace petition is already organized in some countries, according to the invitation of the Peace Congress last year, and will doubtless soon be in others, it seems to me that the proposition of

Mr. Landis could not profitably be considered here in America. I propose, however, that it be referred to the Business Committee.

A scheme for disarmament has, likewise, been placed in the hands of the Committee of Arrangements by Mr. W. H. Blymyer. This also should go to the Business Committee.

On motion the papers were so referred.

The following message from the Suffrage Congress was read and referred to the Business Committee.

CHICAGO, August 14, 1893.

To the President and Members of the International Peace Congress :

GENTLEMEN —At a meeting of the Suffrage Congress recently held in this city, it was considered desirable that steps should be taken to eventuate in action those strivings for the public good which had actuated the discussions of that Congress, as well as those which may be discussed by others of the congresses yet to be held in this city.

It was considered that the means by which the objects of the various congresses are to be attained must be educational, and the Suffrage Congress has appointed five delegates (with power to add to their number) to meet like delegates to be appointed by such other congresses, to form a committee for the purpose of determining the best means to secure the diffusion of correct knowledge and to endeavor to carry out such plans as they may determine on.

With this view Dr. M. R. Levenson, Prof. J. R. Commins, Miss Katherine J. Muessen, Messrs. Alfred Cridge, W. D. McCrackan and Stoughton Cooley have been appointed delegates from the Suffrage Congress.

They invite your co-operation, and ask you to appoint delegates to meet them and delegates from such other congresses, in a joint committee, to consider such educational measures as may be best adapted to effectuate the objects of the different congresses.

Respectfully submitted,

MONTAGUE R. LEVERSON,
Temporary Chairman.

W. D. McCrackan,
Temporary Secretary.

The Secretary presented the following message of salutation from Mr. Jules Tripier, of the Peace Society of Abbeville and Ponthieu, France.

"On the occasion of the Fifth Universal Peace Congress at Chicago, I have the honor of offering my heartiest salutations to the President of the Congress and through him to the noble American nation of which he is one of the worthiest citizens.

"My congratulations to the people which has no war budget. It has no need of any, for it has placed liberty above all things else. It has placed peace above war, civilization above barbarism, reason above folly; right and justice it has set before brutal force and oppression.

"My cordial and fraternal salutations to all the citizens of the world, who have a common inspiration from the same God, to walk hand in hand toward the "promised land" where neither conquerors nor conquered shall be known. To abhor war is to honor God, one's country and humanity."

The Congress then adjourned.

Summary of the paper of Madame Griess-Traut.

The transformation of armies is in harmony with the moral and material needs of the time.

1. That the object of the Peace Societies, the substitution of arbitration for war, is attainable is to be inferred from the sympathetic attention given to it, as seen from the following facts: (a) The choice of arbitration as the subject of the Bodin prize given by the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences; (b) the adoption of arbitration by governments for the settlement of a number of cases of difficulty; (c) the political and social eminence of many of the adherents to the peace cause; (d) the marked interest of the press.

2. It is manifest that this object is in harmony with the aspirations of peoples. This is shown by the action of the Interparliamentary League and by the votes of labor associations.

3. This object is in harmony with the economic interests of the nations. Arbitration has already been of great economic utility.

4. The object of the Peace Societies can not be in harmony with the object of armies. War is the great dispenser of grades and honors. Armies are made up from the young and the strong, the old and helpless being left at home. Staff officers are fond of promotion, and their prerogatives are detrimental to other classes of society which are plunged by war into distress and ruin. Armies, therefore, so long as they exist, ought to be put to work for the public good.

5. The interests of the laboring classes are especially opposed to war. There is plenty of useful work which the standing armies could be set to accomplish—draining of marshes, planting of trees, changing of water courses, etc. The treasures of science which go to the equipment of armies might thus be made to promote the interests of society, instead of being destructive.

6. Armies thus employed would be much better prepared for the national defence than those leading the enervating life of the barracks.

The time has come for the realization of such a project, already seen by eminent persons to be possible. There are already numerous precedents in its favor, as that of Marshal Bugeaud in Algeria.

TENTH SESSION.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19TH, 10 A. M.

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, of Boston, was introduced as Chairman of the morning and the meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. H. S. Clubb, of Philadelphia.

ALFRED H. LOVE, Chairman of the Committee having charge of the Peace Exhibit at the Exposition, made a brief report of the progress of the Exhibit, which consisted of portraits of some of the most distinguished peace men and women of this century, of maps and charts showing the size and cost of standing armies; of others showing important cases of arbitration; of white-bordered peace flags from several countries; of famous treaties of peace; of various important peace publications, etc., etc.

MRS. LOCKWOOD, Chairman of the Branch of the International Peace Bureau established in connection with the Exhibit, made a short report of the work done in distributing peace literature and in securing names on the Peace Register placed in the Exhibit section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen—You will see that the program to-day differs in a very important degree from that of the previous days of the Congress. Heretofore we have been dealing with the larger and international aspects of this problem of peace and war, but to-day we come right home to those features of the question which have to do in a vital way with the interest of the masses of mankind. This subject of preserving peace between labor and capital is on the whole the most important subject which we can consider. We give to it only a single day in this Congress, but I feel sure that before many years have passed by it will receive a much larger share of our attention. It is going to receive a larger share of the best thought of the thinkers of the world, until some solution is arrived at by which we may preserve peace between employers and laboring men either employed singly or in numbers that rise possibly to thousands, and, I was going to say, to tens of thousands in single industries. That peace may be had between them and their employers, and that the best welfare of workingmen may be looked after by those of us who are able, is a matter of very great concern.

We have a few very interesting papers to present to you this morning. The first has been prepared by Charles H. Walcott, President of the Massachusetts State Board of Arbitration, and will be read by Dr. Trueblood.

DR. TRUEBLOOD then read Mr. Walcott's paper as follows :

STATE ARBITRATION IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1886-1893.

The subject of industrial arbitration was brought into prominence in Massachusetts through the astonishing rise and growth of the Knights of Labor.

One of the aims of that order is declared to be "the enactment of laws providing for arbitration between employers and employed, and to enforce the decisions of the arbitrators;" also "to persuade employers to agree to arbitrate all differences which may arise between them and their employees, in order that the bonds of sympathy between them may be strengthened, and that strikes may be rendered unnecessary."

In order to put in practice the principle here announced, joint boards of arbitration, as they were called, which were composed of equal numbers of manufacturers and workmen, were formed in some of the shoe manufacturing towns. There was however one essential element lacking in these boards. No umpire was provided for, and the result generally was that after repeated sessions and a great many indecisive votes, and when everybody was tired of wrangling, one would change his vote, and so bring the matter to an end, but at the risk of being stigmatized as a renegade to the cause which he had been put forward to advocate. In these contests it was simply a question of physical endurance. The boards were composed at the outset of irreconcilable elements, and the decisions arrived at in the manner just described were not such as to commend themselves on their merits or to invite a repetition of the process. The disputants might have said with Shakespeare :

"The end crowns all;
And that old common arbitrator, Time,
Will one day end it."

There is no doubt, however, that these joint boards, by bringing employers and operatives together on terms of equality were productive of much good. The benefit would have been perceptibly greater had there been an umpire in the background ready to step in and decide questions in the event of a dead-lock. Herein is one of the principal merits of the Massachusetts law, that not only does it provide for a fit representation of capital and labor, but it secures also a permanent umpire or referee. Without him, you may have a well devised system of checks and balances, but the more nearly perfect it is, by so much is action or decision rendered difficult or impossible.

In the year 1886, the General Court of Massachusetts enacted a law "to provide for a State Board of Arbitration for the settlement of differences between employers and their employees." The governor was charged with the appointment of the Board and it was provided that one member must be an employer or selected from some association representing employers of labor; another was required to be a member of some labor organization and not an employer of labor. The third member of the Board is appointed in the same manner, but upon the recommendation of the other two. While all are in theory of law impartial, he really holds the position of umpire.

The Board has been made up, in accordance with these provisions, to consist of an employer who is a practical man of business, and well versed in the customs of trade, a shoe-cutter who is also a member of the Knights of Labor, and a lawyer.

Lest it may be thought that the functions of umpire are unduly emphasized, I can testify with pleasure to the fact that the peculiar qualifications of the other members of the Board, representing, respectively, capital and labor, are of the greatest practical value in enabling the Board to secure confidence of both sides, and to communicate readily with them, as well as to insure a good result in the decision itself. Furthermore, I must not omit to say that, in every case that has thus far arisen, the Board has acted as a unit when the time for decision had arrived. And if, during the consideration of the subject, a dissenting voice has been raised, it has never been heard outside of the limits of the consultation room. This unanimity is, under the circumstances, not the least noteworthy incident of the subject which we are treating, and undoubtedly tends to add force to all the recommendations made by the Board.

Upon the receipt of an application in writing from an employer, or from the majority of the employees in any department of the business in which a controversy occurs (and such employees may be represented by a duly authorized agent) it is the duty of the Board to visit, as soon as may be, the place where the dispute is, make careful inquiry into the cause of it, hear all the persons interested, and make a decision in writing advising the parties what if anything ought to be done or submitted to, by either or both, in order to adjust the dispute.

These provisions apply when the Board is called upon by either or both of the parties to the controversy and under this part of the law the more formal work of the Board as a Board of Arbitration has been done. Here everything is judicial and regular, and not materially different from any ordinary reference, except that everything is done under the broad shield of the Commonwealth. There is no strike or lock-out, or if one has occurred, it is at once ended, operations are resumed and continued until a decision is reached. In such cases the decision is binding for

the term of six months upon all who join in the proceedings ; but either party may give to the other in writing a notice that he does not intend to be bound by the decision at the expiration of sixty days from the giving of such notice. The term of six months has been found by experience to be convenient in arranging price-lists for manufactories in this State, and it is naturally suggested by the customs and movements of trade. Should the Board however fall into any serious error and persist in it, the statute gives either party the opportunity to change the situation within sixty days by giving notice. Twice only has it been attempted to annul a decision in this manner ; and in both these cases the recommendation of the Board continued in force, notwithstanding the assaults upon them.

But it is not a board of arbitration alone that is provided for by our law—a tribunal that shall hold its sessions in due form, hear evidence and arguments, and give formal decisions. The functions of mediation and conciliation are added ; and whenever in any manner it comes to the knowledge of the Board that a strike or lock-out is seriously threatened or has actually occurred in the Commonwealth, involving any person or corporation employing not less than twenty-five persons in the same general line of business, it is the duty of the Board to put itself in communication as soon as may be with the parties “and endeavor by mediation to effect an amicable settlement.” If a strike or lock-out has actually occurred and the efforts of the Board to bring about an understanding prove fruitless, it may, if it deems such a course advisable, proceed to investigate the cause or causes of the controversy, without an application from any one, ascertain which party thereto is mainly responsible or blameworthy for its existence or continuance and make and publish a report finding such cause or causes of the controversy, and assigning such responsibility or blame.

Clearly it was believed by the proposers of this legislation that there were differences which could not be satisfactorily dealt with by the courts and might properly fall within the scope of a new tribunal like that contemplated by the act. For by the terms of the statute itself the new Board is to have jurisdiction only of the controversies or differences “not involving questions which may be the subject of a suit at law or bill in equity.”

It was made the duty of the Board after certain preliminaries to “advise the respective parties what if anything ought to be done or submitted to by either or both to adjust” their disputes.

“Ought to be done or submitted to.” The action of our legislators on its face presupposed a “higher law” than the Public Statutes, a broader equity than is recognized or administered by judges and jury.

In point of fact the matters considered by the Board have been chiefly questions of wages, hours of labor, the imposition of fines

for imperfect work, and the discharge of workmen. The question of wages which is nearly always the real question, although some other matters may have been forced into temporary prominence, frequently involves a careful inquiry into the capacity and practical working of new machines, a conscientious comparison of rival machines, and their respective merits when brought into competition with work of the hands unaided by mechanical devices.

Were I to express in formal language my estimate of the value of the Board and the extent of its influence as an economic force affecting the industries of the State, I might perhaps appear to claim too much for it. But it is by its practical efficiency, and not on any sentimental or theoretical grounds, that the Board ought to be judged, and by this test must its usefulness be demonstrated.

On this head I might quote the words of manufacturers, who say that the fact that there is such a board to appeal to renders it easier for them to agree with their employees, and that the decisions of the Board have made it possible for them to do business in this State at a profit, when otherwise to avoid constant bickerings and pecuniary loss they would have been obliged to remove business to the villages of Maine or New Hampshire.

There is also the testimony of workingmen that they never received the recognition that they craved, and thought themselves entitled to, until they met their employers face to face in the presence of this Board, and were for the time at least treated as equals.

To the casual observer this may appear to be a small matter, but the wise judge better; for they know that life and property can not be permanently safe under any form of government, if the poor and the hard working members of society are persistently shut out from association and sympathy with the more fortunate, and are placed in an inferior and degraded position merely because they are forced to earn their bread by labor, and to receive their compensation at the hands of an employer, in the form of wages. However this may be it is certain that the board has constantly served as an aid in the settlement of disputes, either by advice informally offered or by formal decisions: and the suggestion that the question in dispute be left to the decision of the Board has often hastened a settlement by agreement.

It has been proved by experience that the State Board can prepare long and complex lists of wages which commend themselves as practicable and fair to employers and workmen, not only to those immediately interested as parties, but to the trade generally.

In order to secure the greatest possible accuracy in comparison of details and for the better information of the Board concerning matters peculiar to the trade in question, the law provides for two

sworn expert assistants, who are paid by the State, and appointed by the Board. They may be selected by the respective parties to the case in hand, but, when appointed, act as the agents of the Board and under its direction. The Board whenever it deems it necessary appoints other expert assistants, without notice to the parties.

The aid rendered by expert assistants has been found to be of great material value to the Board in acting upon price-lists in the different trades, and results have been reached and promulgated with reference to wages of granite-cutters, shoemakers, iron-moulders, tanners, spinners, weavers, horse-shoers, etc., which have not only stood the test of criticism in the particular cases acted upon, but have been used as standards for reference in other establishments in the same trade or in later controversies existing in the same factory.

The question is frequently asked, "In what proportion of cases decided by the Board are its recommendations accepted?" The inquiry is a pertinent one; for all systems of government or methods of business must eventually stand or fall when judged by the practical results accomplished.

During the seven years which have elapsed since the Board was established I know of but two cases in which either employer or employed failed to accept the decision of the Board in a case submitted jointly under the forms and with the agreements specified by law. In one of the cases referred to the employer was the person in fault and in the other the employees.

In some instances, as would naturally be expected, when the Board has held the position of mediator, and in cases submitted by one side only, the advice given has not been at once accepted and acted upon by the persons who appeared to be in the wrong, or were advised to do something distasteful to them. But in some cases of this kind even the moral influence of the Board has been so strong that its advice has in the end prevailed. The few instances in which employer or employees have declined to accept the advice or received the assistance proffered by the Board in the name of the State can for the most part be accounted for easily. Their reluctance may arise from doubt as to the justice of their cause or from a plentiful lack of information concerning the Board and its methods of procedure, or most preposterous of all, it may proceed from the selfish determination manifested by some men to have their own way simply because it is their own way, or as one coolly expressed it, "right or wrong" he would have it so.

Pride, selfishness and ignorance are the chief obstacles in our path. They are old offenders and the world has been a great sufferer by reason of them.

I have touched upon a few points which were suggested by the practical workings of arbitration and conciliation in Massachusetts. Many others urge themselves upon our notice, but I must hasten

forward. The history of our Board is a short one covering a period of less than seven years, and during that time there have been frequent occasions for the exercise of patience when the imperfections of human nature proved impregnable to reason and common sense, but the results achieved in Massachusetts have certainly exceeded the expectations of many who were willing that the experiment should be tried but were not very sanguine as to results.

The Board has I believe favorably impressed those with whom it has come in contact, and with the community at large I think I may say that it has won a reputation for honest, painstaking endeavor to promote kindly feelings and just relations between employers and workingmen for the benefit of all and the injury of none.

The influence of the Board in this direction is certainly great, but it can no more be measured and weighed than one can estimate in figures the value of the quickening power of the sunlight and the rain upon the landscape before us. The Board is not invested with any compulsory powers, it simply advises and recommends, and when unable to induce the parties to come to any understanding, it may in the last resort pass judgment in the name of the State and assign the blame for the existence or continuance of the controversy.

However the advice offered may be received in particular cases, the Board never forgets that it is a Board of conciliation as well as a tribunal empowered to judge and report.

Whenever a strike or lock-out occurs, involving a considerable number of people, and the parties, one or both, prefer for any reason to neglect the means provided by law for the settlement of disputes of this character, the complaint is certain to come from some quarter that the power of the Board should be increased, and that there ought to be some way provided for compelling people to be reasonable and just in their relations to those with whom they are associated in productive industry.

The mere suggestion that the Board should have power to enforce its decisions is in itself gratifying evidence that the decisions thus far made are in the public estimation worthy of enforcement.

Without expressing any opinion of my own concerning the wisdom of these suggestions, it should be borne in mind that if any form of compulsory arbitration, as it is called, is ever adopted, some way must be devised by which employer and employees may come equally under its influence. The employer being an individual, a copartnership, or a corporation, could always be found and identified by a person armed with a legal process, but the employer must be left at liberty to abandon his business, rather than pursue it at a loss under the unfavorable decision of a board of arbitration. On the other hand it is difficult to conceive how any

process could be framed under which hundreds of men and women should be compelled to work in accordance with the terms of a decision which in their estimation would not provide for them a fair return for their labor. Any legislation proposed with such an end in view would be justly liable to the objection that it was attempting to legalize slavery.

I apprehend that the popular notion, that the State Board should be endowed with greater power and a large jurisdiction, arises from a misconception of the power that is now exercised by it and the extent of the beneficent influence now exerted by it on a plan that is purely voluntary.

I believe that the modern practice of providing for the exercise of some of the important prerogatives of government by the agency of State commissions had its origin in wisdom, and is founded on a true appreciation of the power of public opinion, and the desire and capacity of the people to judge fairly and with accuracy the acts of the masses, and individuals who form the community in which we live. In process of time, and that, too, before many years have passed over our heads, we shall wonder at our distrust of the efficacy of public opinion as a compelling force; and those men or associations of men, be they employers or workmen, who shall dare to assert a selfish preference for a course that meets with the condemnation of an intelligent public sentiment will be seen of all men in their true light, as opponents of the power which gives rise to all legislation, and makes possible the enforcement of law for the protection of life and property. "It is not Lord Granville himself," says Matthew Arnold, "who determines our foreign policy and shapes the declarations of government concerning it, but a power behind Lord Granville. He and his colleagues would call it the power of the public opinion."

If this be a true statement as it no doubt is of the influence which controls the relations of Great Britain with other countries, how infinitely more important it is that this influence be not neglected or underrated in a country where "all men are born free and equal," and the principles of popular representative government are more firmly established.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now have the pleasure of listening to a paper on the subject of Courts of Conciliation, by Professor William Watts Folwell, Professor of Political Science and Lecturer on International Law in the University of Minnesota.

The following is an abstract of Professor Folwell's paper prepared by himself.

COURTS OF CONCILIATION.

In human society "it must needs be that offences come." . . . By mere ignorance of the nature and effects of actions we are

brought into collision with one another. . . . But selfishness and passion cause the greater part of social interferences. . . . Civilization consists in great part in the taming of passion, and the harmonizing of interests. To be peaceable is to be civil. Although it has been from time immemorial a chief function of the State to compose disputes between citizens, it is a melancholy fact that the greater number of wrongs never come within her actual jurisdiction. The expenditure of many millions of public funds in our country, still leaves the private suitor to pay largely for the use of the judicial apparatus. It is notorious that the poor man cannot go to law. Hence, the frequent demands for "gratuitous justice" recently sounding from many quarters.

There are three ways of disposing of social differences.

First, by far the largest number is simply dropped and at length, forgotten. . . .

A second method of determining controversies, is arbitration, the two contending parties resorting to a third, in some way empowered to hear and determine. The simplest case is where the arbiter is named by the parties who mutually agree to abide by his decision. This was the primitive original from which all known systems of judicature have been derived. All modern Courts are elaborated tribunals of arbitration, whose decrees are sanctioned by the power of the State.

The object of the litigating parties is to obtain such a favorable decision. Each so states his contentions, arrays his evidence, and argues his case as to persuade the tribunal to pronounce for his side. The trial is a mimic war, in which eloquence, invective and chicane play a capital part.

The cost and vexation of litigation has of late occasioned a revulsion in favor of the primitive way of private arbitration. The very moderate degree of success which has attended the operation of the statutes enacted in that behalf is quite discouraging. Cost has not been eliminated, the "hearings" retain many objectionable features of regular trials, and the poor man is just as helpless as before.

The main object of this paper is to bring into clear light a third plan for the settlement of controversies — that of conciliation and to show how it may be made to enter into a system of public justice.

The term is self-descriptive and suggests the composition of differences by mutual conference and free consent. Like arbitration conciliation is ancient and has always been practised, but it has remained a purely social principle, and has only to a limited extent been brought into the political fabric of States. The kingdoms of Denmark and Norway furnish the happiest examples of the embodiment of the principle of conciliation into systems of public justice.

By a royal decree of 1795, a certain ancient and traditional principle, but partially defined, was elevated into a positive law of the Danish-Norwegian kingdom, to the effect that no citizen should have the right, as a general rule, to resort to the ordinary trial courts with a civil cause, until after unsuccessful effort to obtain justice in a so-called Court of Conciliation. The immediate effect of the law in Denmark proper was to lessen the number of law-suits more than one-half. In the decade ending in 1880 but one-sixth of the three hundred thousand civil complaints in that country reached the trial courts. Norway becoming independent of Denmark in 1814, ten years later collated and elaborated the laws relating to courts of conciliation into an admirable statute, which has since been amended only in minor details. The Norwegian law may be taken as the form or type of the system.

In each primary political precinct are elected two "Commissioners of Conciliation," who sit together at stated intervals for the consideration of complaints. All civil matters including matrimonial difficulties are within their cognizance. They cannot however decree divorces.

The essential central principle of the system is, that no evil case can be heard in a trial court, unless it be shown that the parties have failed to come to a settlement before Commissioners of Conciliation.

At the appointed time the parties to a controversy appear and sit down with the Commissioners behind closed doors. No lawyers are or can be present. The Commissioners advise but do not hear and determine. If the parties, as is commonly the fact, come to an agreement, a record is made and signed by them and by the Commissioners. This record may have the effect of a judgment upon which execution may be had within a year and a day.

If the parties fail to come to terms the complainant receives a certificate, which entitles him to begin a fight in the trial court of appropriate jurisdiction.

When Commissioners are successful in assisting the parties to a friendly composition, they are each entitled to a small fee; but, no settlement, no fee.

The experience of a century has justified the wisdom of this excellent legislation in Norway as well as in Denmark. The figures given below from official sources show its operation in the former kingdom for a half century.

Doubtless there are facts and circumstances favorable to the existence and operation of conciliation in Norway and Denmark, but it cannot be that these Scandinavians possess exclusively the qualities and environment necessary to the institution. A people like ourselves who have borrowed our jurisprudence from Greeks,

Romans and Teutons ought to be both willing and able to adopt and assimilate a system which has been proven so effectual in composing social disputes, substantially without cost. . . .

In such a plan imbedded in our system of public justice we might find a happy response to the demand for gratuitous justice.

Without delay, and practically without expense the aggrieved artisan or domestic might summon the defaulting or oppressive employee before a tribunal, whose office would be to assist the parties in an immediate and mutual understanding.

So far, at least, justice ought to be free in any civilized country. We may be questioned whether the State should go further, and provide for litigation at the public expense. . . .

As to the particular way by which Courts of Conciliation might be introduced into our American system of public justice, the suggestion at once arises of converting our justices of the peace into Commissions of Conciliation, but it would be fatal to the experiment to make the justice's court both a Court of Conciliation and a trial court, as has been proposed in a Western State. . . .

The mere introduction of the machinery of conciliation will be of little avail, if it should prove that our people enjoy law-suits more than peace among neighbors. . . .

It would be a mistake to indulge in extravagant expectations. Not all disputes can be conciliated. . . . There are issues so novel and so complicated that only learned experts can disentangle them and determine the relations and rights of the parties. Law-suits will continue to be held; attorneys must plead and argue; judges must hear and determine. But the true lawyer, the wise counsellor of clients and sound adviser of courts will always hold an honored place in free States and will never deny nor disparage the noble maxim of his profession, "*Interest reipublicæ est finis sit litium.*" The public good requires that law-suits come to an end.

N. B. A continuation of this paper showing the extension of courts of conciliation into France, Belgium and Germany furnishes interesting proof that the Scandinavians are not the only people who can introduce the principle of conciliation into systems of public justice.

Decades ending in	Complaints brought before Courts of Conciliation.	Referred to Trial Courts.	Actually Litigated.
1845	654,793	251,124	36,843
1855	595,550	253,774	42,155
1865	874,930	320,204	52,848
1875	859,239	204,483	34,309
1885	1,105,619	144,631	35,430
	4,090,131	1,174,216	201,585

THE CHAIRMAN. Our third and last paper will be on the subject of Commercial Arbitration by Boards of Trade, by a citizen of Chicago, Mr. H. H. Aldrich, of the Board of Trade.

MR. ALDRICH: I would like the time to show, in a brief paper that I have prepared, the results that have been accomplished by arbitration on a pretty extended scale in commercial transactions, and I think that I shall perhaps differ in a slight degree from some of the statements made by the gentleman that has preceded me in regard to the working of the principles of arbitration.

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION BY BOARDS OF TRADE.

Arbitration as a principle is not a new or novel thing, but the application in any extensive way to the settlement of differences, or disputes, arising in commercial transactions is the result of the organization of large trading bodies, known as Stock or Produce Exchanges, or Boards of Trade. Nearly all organizations of the kind referred to provide regular tribunals, usually called Committees of Arbitration and Appeals, to which all members of the body may go for the adjustment of disputes arising in the transaction of business.

Being familiar with the working of these committees in the Chicago Board of Trade, and finding upon examination into the facts that the practice of other organizations in this country is not only similar, but is largely based upon that of the Chicago Board, I shall refer especially to that body as illustrating in a general and forceful manner the results following the application in a large way of the principle.

In 1859 the Legislature of the State of Illinois granted a charter creating "A body politic and corporate, under the name and style of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago."

Two of the sections of said charter read as follows :

SECT. 7. Said corporation may constitute and appoint Committees of Reference and Arbitration, and Committees of Appeals, who shall be governed by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed in the Rules, Regulations or By-Laws for the settlement of such matters of difference as may be voluntarily submitted for arbitration by members of the Association, or by other persons not members thereof ; the acting chairman of either of said committees, when sitting as arbitrators, may administer oaths to the parties and witnesses and issue subpoenas and attachments, compelling the attendance of witnesses, the same as justices of the peace, and in like manner directed to any constable to execute.

SECT. 8. When any submission shall have been made in writing, and a final award shall have been rendered, and no appeal taken within the time fixed by the Rules or By-Laws, then

on filing such award and submission with the Clerk of the Circuit Court, an execution may issue upon such award as if it were a judgment rendered in the Circuit Court, and such award shall thenceforth have the force and effect of such a judgment, and shall be entered upon the judgment docket of said court.

The charter of the New York Produce Exchange confers the same powers, and provides that "judgments entered in conformity with such award shall not be subject to be removed, reversed, modified, or in any manner appealed from by the parties thereto, except for frauds, collusion, or corruption of said Arbitration Committee, or some member thereof."

The powers granted in that part of the Charter of the Chicago Board, which I have read, have always been considered of great value. There have been times in the past few years when for weighty reasons the question of the surrender of its Charter was seriously considered by the officers of the Board, and strongly recommended, and such action would undoubtedly have been taken but for this provision. The legal advisers to whom the question was several times referred, gave us their opinion that but for these sections the surrender of the charter and the organization under the general corporation laws of the State would be advisable. They would not, however, in view of the advantages conferred by those two Sections advise the change.

The Rule of the Association by which the Committees of Arbitration and Appeal are governed, is in part as follows :

RULE VIII.

COMMITTEES OF ARBITRATION AND APPEALS.

SECT. 1. It shall be the duty of the Committee of Arbitration to hear and determine all cases of disputed claims voluntarily submitted for their adjudication by members of the Association. All evidence in such cases shall be taken under oath or affirmation, except documentary evidence, which shall be sworn to, if demanded by either party and the Committee decide it to be necessary, and shall be duly recorded. In all such adjudications the Committee shall construe all Rules, Regulations and By-Laws of the Associations as being designed to secure justice and equity in trade; and all awards or findings shall be made in conformity therewith.

In case either party shall so demand, by previous notice given to the Secretary, the testimony and proceedings of the Committee of Arbitration shall be taken by a stenographer, the cost of which shall be assessed by the Committee as in cases of other costs incurred.

SECT. 2. Any award or findings of the Committee of Arbitration may be appealed from, and the case may be carried to the Committee of Appeals for revision; provided, notice of such

appeal shall be given to the Secretary, in writing, within two business days after such award or finding shall have been delivered to the parties in controversy.

SECT. 3. It shall be the duty of the Committee of Appeals to review such cases as may be appealed from the Committee of Arbitration and formerly brought before it, and its awards or findings shall be final and binding, and shall not be subject to revision by any other tribunal of the Association; provided, the Board of Directors may determine, from the record and other evidence, as to the proper constitution of any committee and as to the regularity of its proceedings. The said Committee of Appeals shall receive such new evidence as may be offered under oath or affirmation; and if, in its judgment, evidence is produced which will justify a rehearing of the case by the Committee of Arbitration, it shall remand the case to the said Committee of Arbitration for a new trial. Any final award or finding of the Committee of Appeals shall be based on the record of the Committee of Arbitration, and shall be made in like manner as prescribed by Section 1 of this Rule.

SECT. 4. Five of either of these committees shall be a quorum for the transaction of business, and a majority decision of such quorum shall be binding.

SECT. 5. The Committee of Arbitration and the Committee of Appeals shall each render their awards or findings in writing, through the Secretary of the Association, within two business days after their decisions shall have been made. Such awards or findings shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee, and shall be certified by the Secretary under the seal of the Association. The official records and decisions of these committees and all other records of the Association, may be inspected by any member of the Association upon application to the Secretary.

SECT. 6. When, from absence or disqualification of regular members either the Committee of Arbitration or Appeals cannot be formed, the parties in controversy shall be allowed to fill vacancies with any member or members of the Association willing to serve (not being of the other committee), on whom they may agree; or if such parties are unwilling to submit their case to the Committee of Arbitration, they may choose three or more members (willing to serve, and not being of the Committee of Appeals), whom they may agree upon; such agreement, in either case, to be communicated to the Secretary in writing, signed by all parties in controversy. A majority award or finding of any such committee shall be binding, and any award or finding of committees thus formed shall be made under the same Rules, and shall have the same effect as if made by the regular committees respectively.

SECT. 7. Before entering upon the duties of their office the

members of any Committee of Arbitration or Committee of Appeals shall be required to take or subscribe to the following oath or affirmation, viz.: "You do solemnly swear (or affirm) that you respectively will faithfully and fairly hear and examine all matters of controversy which may come before you during your tenure of office, and that you will in all cases make just and equitable awards or findings upon the same, in conformity with the Rules, Regulations and By-Laws of the Association, and according to the evidence, to the best of your understanding; so help you God."

SECT. 8. The Chairman or Acting Chairman of any Committee of Arbitration or Appeals shall have power to administer suitable oaths to the parties and witnesses, and to issue citations to witnesses.

SECT. 9. Parties desiring the services of either of the foregoing committees shall notify the Secretary to that effect in writing, and, before the hearing of the case, shall file an agreement with him, signed by the parties to the controversy, binding themselves to abide, perform and fulfil the final award or finding which shall be made touching the matter submitted, without recourse to any other court or tribunal. Neither party shall postpone the trial of a case longer than ten days after it has been submitted, unless good cause can be shown therefor, satisfactory to the committee. Trifling and unimportant matters shall not be entertained by the Committee of Arbitration. Any member of a firm may execute said agreement on behalf of such firm.

SECT. 11. The fees for arbitration, under the Rules, By-Laws and Regulations of the Association, shall be as follows:

For each case where the amount in controversy shall be under \$500	\$10 00
Where the amount in controversy shall be from \$500 to \$1000	15 00
Where the amount in controversy shall be from \$1000 to \$1500	20 00
Where the amount in controversy shall be from \$1500 to \$2500	25 00
Where the amount in controversy shall be from \$2500 upward	50 00

The fees, as above, shall be paid in advance, to the Secretary, by the party bringing the case, and shall be equally divided between the members of the committee hearing the case.

SECT. 12. The fees of the Committee of Appeals shall be the same as the fees in the same case before the Committee of Arbitration, and they shall be paid and disposed of in the same manner.

In 1880 sixty-five cases were heard by the Committee of Arbitration of which nineteen were appealed. In 1881 one hundred cases were heard, twenty-eight of which were appealed. In 1882 there were ninety-one cases heard, thirty being appealed. These were years of great activity upon the Board, and the number of cases was above the average.

In 1890 there were forty cases with sixteen appeals. In 1891, twenty-six cases of which six were appealed, and in 1892, fifty-one cases with twenty-three appeals. These were years of nominal activity though in 1891 the number of trials was much below the average. The total number of cases heard in the six years given were three hundred and seventy-three, an average of sixty-two each year. This average might not hold good for the past twenty years, but during that time at least one thousand cases have been heard and decided by the committees. Less than one-third of the cases heard by the Arbitration Committee have been appealed, showing that more than two-thirds of those submitting their cases have acquiesced in the decision reached in the first instance. But a small percentage of the cases appealed were reversed by the Appeal Committee.

The amount involved in the cases heard during the last three years mentioned, ranged in the several cases from \$2.30 to \$10,500, the total being \$70,000. The fees paid to Arbitrators were less than \$1700.

Many cases are heard where the amount of money involved is small, but the decision of which affects and settles the practice in transactions involving millions of dollars a year. In some cases no amount is stated, the object being to get an official decision upon some point of difference. Some of the cases presented are trivial and ought not to be submitted, but in the main the settlement of disputes where small amounts of money are involved is of advantage, removing small causes of irritation which might affect unfavorably the daily intercourse of men whose business is dependent in a remarkable degree upon the confidence and respect felt each for the other.

Analyzing a little more closely the figures given, we find that one hundred and seventeen cases, involving \$70,000 in money, were tried in the three years 1890, '91 and '92. That the fees paid the Arbitrators were less than \$1700, or 2.40 per cent. of the amount involved. The average fees paid in each case being less than fifteen dollars. Forty-five of the cases were appealed adding to the cost of the litigation \$675. The total cost including the appeals, being \$2355, or less than 3.40 per cent. of the amount involved and twenty dollars on the average for each case.

The fee for the Arbitrators is usually the whole cost of having cases heard, as practising attorneys are not allowed to appear before the Committees of the Chicago Board. If a party with a case to be heard does not feel competent to present it himself, he

may engage any member of the Board (not a practising attorney) to appear for him, or conduct his case for him. Rules of evidence as interpreted in the courts, are not strictly followed, but irrelevant testimony is ruled out when objection is made by any of the parties to the case, and usually by the chairman of the committee when objection is not made. The case is conducted upon the basis of getting the facts, and the committee will usually assist a party not familiar with such procedure to present them in an orderly manner.

The average amount involved in such case heard was in round numbers \$600.

Apply these figures to the work of the committees for twenty years, we have, as already stated, one thousand cases. Amount of money involved \$600,000; cost including appeals \$20,000.

This does not tell the whole story. Take the item of time expended. It is of frequent occurrence that parties agree to arbitration, sign the necessary papers, notify their witnesses, appear and present their cases to the committee and get the award within a week from the time the difference arises. Two or three weeks usually covers the whole time that passes before the dispute is ended. Even when an appeal is taken a month is more than the average time taken to get the difference settled. In what other way could such results be reached? A thousand cases in the courts of Cook County would mean something in the way of expense alone. I think it safe to estimate that the cost of prosecuting these causes in our courts would be, to the litigants alone, ten times what it has cost them before their own tribunals. The cost to the State would be a large sum in addition to that expended by the parties to the suits. But the saving of money is of less importance than the saving in time. We can make no estimate here, and only those familiar with the delays of justice in our courts can properly appreciate what it would amount to.

To say that the delay, which is a matter of course, in suits at law in our courts, is a denial of justice, is but to repeat what has been said many times. It is a fact, however, which deserves attention in discussing the advantages of other ways of settling commercial disputes. The advantages that have accrued to the Chicago Board of Trade in this matter are obvious.

First, the saving of money—twenty thousand dollars for twenty years of litigation in a body with nineteen hundred members, transacting a business that is counted by the hundred millions each year! A thousand dollars a year to secure the prompt and satisfactory settlement of differences arising among such a number of men, when such vast interests are involved daily.

Second, the saving of time. As it takes, so I am credibly informed, more than a year to reach a case after it has been begun in our courts, with the many and vexatious delays that are likely to follow before the matter is heard, it is plain that the

gain here is something enormous. In fact, the prompt settlement of these differences is the important thing.

Third, the cheerful acquiescence of the parties in the decisions, it being a very unusual thing for anyone to question the result when announced by the Committee of Appeals if they have not already been satisfied with the award of the Committee of Arbitration. Of course, few parties are entirely satisfied when a case is decided against them, but they cheerfully submit to the results and the sense of irritation soon disappears.

Fourth : The matter is heard and decided by those who are familiar with the customs and necessities of the trade in which all are more or less engaged. The parties are known to them, and while an arbitrator may not properly be directly interested in any case heard by him, he has an indirect interest in having all cases properly decided, as it will settle the custom in the business in which he is engaged.

It is very unusual for a member of the Board to go to the law courts to get a settlement of differences with other members of the Board. He may do so if he prefers that way, but his interest is usually to submit the matter to his brother members and abide by the award they make.

The practice and the results in other large commercial bodies in the United States are similar. In some of these bodies the membership is made up largely of those who are engaged in mercantile business other than that carried on upon Produce Exchanges, and the means for settling commercial disputes by arbitration are ready at their command. I have not had time since my assignment to the honorable position of Essayist upon this subject, to collect any but general information; but in the stated reports of the different bodies I find that the committees appointed for this very responsible duty hold an honored place.

Having served a number of years upon the Committees of Arbitration and Appeals of the Chicago Board, I speak not only with some knowledge, but with a feeling of great respect for the underlying principle upon which they are founded. Exact justice may not always be attained in the awards that are made, but it is not currently reported that the millennium of equal and exact justice has been reached by the juries that are presented to litigants in our courts of record.

THE CHAIRMAN : The secretary has a paper to present by title.

DR. TRUEBLOOD : I have in my hands a paper that was received some time since but was not put on the program of the Congress. I wish to announce it now simply by the name of the writer, and it will appear in full in the printed Report of the Congress. It is by Mr. S. M. Burroughs, of England, and treats upon the subjects of customs-tariffs and the single tax on land, in the inter-

ests of peace. The Committee, in deciding to publish it in the Report of the Congress, leave the responsibility for its sentiments entirely to Mr. Burroughs.

PAPER OF S. M. BURROUGHS.

Customs-tariffs tend to cause unfriendly feelings between States and nations.

Freedom of trade tends to bring States and nations together in bonds of mutual interest, prosperity, friendship and peace.

The general adoption of free trade would powerfully aid in preventing war by making peace a matter of common and universal interest.

Taxation which restricts industry on the one hand, and creates special privileges on the other, tends to poverty of the industrial classes and builds up an aristocracy upon unearned wealth. It tends to social discontent, leading perhaps to violations of the peace.

The single tax on land values created by the community would ensure perfect freedom of trade, abolish unjust privilege and monopoly, leave to labor its full earnings and secure to the public its rightful revenue, the unearned or community-earned increment upon land.

Brief propositions on such important and far reaching questions should perhaps be followed with arguments and illustrations to prove them, in order that they should not be open to the charge of presumption. I would therefore make the following statements in support of those proposals though they are much better and more fully expressed by Mr. George in his works on "Protection or Free Trade," "Progress and Poverty," "Social Problems" and his essay on "The Condition of Labor."

Historical instances will doubtless occur to all who have given attention to the question in which tariffs between States and nations have led to feelings of irritation, and in some cases constituted a predisposing cause of war.

Among modern instances might be cited the tax on tea levied by Great Britain in her American colonies, which was one of the chief causes leading to the outbreak of the American War of Independence.

Tariffs naturally lead to irritation: the very name is derived from a town in the Straits of Gibraltar called Tarifa, which at one time was the headquarters of a band of free booters who levied taxes on all merchandise passing through the Straits. People feel now as they did then that the merchandise in transit is their rightful property, and many now naturally regard all tariffs as the merchants of the Mediterranean regarded that of Tarifa as robbery or spoliation.

The wars against the Beys of Algiers, Tripoli and Tunis were on account of the tariffs levied by these potentates upon the commerce of other nations.

The so-called retaliatory tariffs between Spain and France, and France and Italy or Switzerland, are often described as tariff wars. It is also notorious that much irritation has been expressed in European countries at the McKinley Tariff in the United States ; very great irritation has been caused between the States and Canada by the respective tariffs of these countries. The President of the United States has powers, which if enforced against the commerce of Canada might be expected to lead to open violence.

The term "retaliatory tariff" seems to be a misnomer in the sense in which it is generally used. It is a tariff war, but the war is upon the people who legalize the tariff. It adds to the cost of the merchandise on which it is levied at the expense of the consumer. It diminishes imports, but as these are always paid for by the exports it diminishes these also, the demand for labor to produce these, thus lowering wages, while at the same time it increases the cost of living.

Peel, the great English minister who was a protectionist but became a convert to free trade, used to declare that the best way to fight tariffs was by free trade.

There is a class of politicians in England who advocate what they call fair trade, that is they would tax goods coming from countries which have a tariff on English goods. A party with similar views in America advocates reciprocity which means admit goods free from countries which admit American goods free. The latter are free traders in practice but not in principle or common sense.

Any protectionist wishing to buy goods of any one else sees the advantage of reducing, as much as possible, all cost and difficulties in the way of obtaining them. This principle is obvious if a family be the purchaser and consumer ; then why not if it be a community, a country, a State or a nation ?

Any protectionist knows that if he buys goods he must pay for them in the products of his industry. If it be in money it is the same thing, for he has had to exchange first the products of his hand or brain to get the money. The same would apply to a family or a community of watch-makers who buy clothing or wood of a family or a community of tailors or farmers. They may pay for the clothing or food in watches, or in money which they receive from some one else in exchange for the watches, therefore increased imports necessarily demand increased exports to pay for them and with free trade every people or person produce what they can make to the best advantage.

As an instance of how free trade can bring States and peoples together in bonds of mutual interest we may observe the fervent

patriotism and indissoluble unity of the Swiss republic for more than five centuries. Though there are differences of race and religion, the cantons are firmly held together by the common interests and wishes of the people.

Other remarkable instances are those of the German Empire and States of America. When under the British Crown the American colonies were separated as colonies from each other, under different English Governors, when they became united under a federal constitution some of the States still maintained tariffs, and these led to many dissensions and tended to disunion.

Slavery which was a form of protection in that it denied to the slaves their liberty of selling their labor for its full value, was the cause of the late deplorable Civil War. The idea of the right of a State to secede from the Union, or to have a tariff on the goods imported from another State is now entirely disallowed.

Free trade between the American States has welded them into a firm union and also has led to mingling of the people of one State with another, so that they are all one people, a homogeneous nation. The same thing is rapidly taking place among the various States of the German Empire and those of Austria and Italy.

The idea of any two or more States of the American Union going to war about any differences that might arise would not be tolerated for a moment by any citizen of any of these countries. Each of them has its supreme court for the settlement of disputes about relations of States to each other, or to the general government, mutual and common. The common interests of the different sections of each country are so great that war is out of the question, arbitration taking its place and making and proving war to be as unnecessary and stupid as it is wicked and fratricidal.

Let us imagine however that each of the different European races which emigrate to America, had each chosen to occupy a particular locality or State by itself, that the Germans had occupied one State, the French another, the Italians another, and that each had adopted a tariff system of its own.

This would have prevented the people from trading with one another, and to a great extent from visiting one another's country, except as mere travellers and sight seers. They would naturally under these conditions have remained as separate and distinct as they are in Europe.

Free trade between the States in America has brought the nationalities of Europe together in loving bonds of mutual interest, friendship and peace, whose parents in Europe regard each other as mutual enemies and are always in arms to defend themselves from the expected aggressions of the others. In the United States the idea of patriotism is not confined to one's native State, but takes in the nation, making all its citizens friends and brothers. Might we not from this example believe that free trade

between the nations of Europe and of the world would result in the same happy consequences, of extending the idea of patriotism to include the whole of humanity.

There is a social war going on in the United States and England and in most civilized countries at the present time owing to the discontent of the workman with his wages. It is often claimed by protectionists that tariffs tend to advance wages, but this is contradicted by facts, because wages are higher in England than in any other European country, and it is also observed that wages are lowest in Russia, Greece, Italy and Spain, where tariffs are highest, and that wages on the Continent rise highest in Switzerland, Germany and France, where tariffs are lowest.

Wages are as high in the United States as in England, and in some cases higher, but the productiveness of labor is greater in the United States.

A chief factor in keeping wages up in America has been the fact that until recently much public land has been obtainable free of charge by settlers, or at a very low price of about six francs per acre for the freehold. On this land men could make three to five dollars a day farming and consequently would not accept less in wages.

Most of the good land has now been taken up by settlers and also by speculators who hold it out of use for higher prices. The would-be settlers and farmers unable to get land are obliged to seek an employer. They compete with one another for employment, forcing wages down to the margin of subsistence, while many are unable to get work.

Workmen have combined in trade unions hoping to keep wages up by strikes if necessary, and these strikes have led to breaches of the peace and loss of life, to the use of fire-arms and cannon, in fact to war on a small scale.

This strife is for the purpose of preventing certain men from employing certain other men, an unlawful breach of individual liberty for the purpose of keeping up wages, the very function which protectionists claim for the tariff, which it is unable to perform or the strikes would not take place.

The low wages and poverty of working classes gradually lead to discontent, especially when contrasted by them to great fortunes gained by others with little or no labor or risk, through the action of tariff laws which enable manufacturers to get higher prices than they would if competition were free, or else through the operation of laws which tax industry and its products, while exempting land values from taxes.

Though the working classes may not always see the cause of their distress at once, still they feel deeply the want of proper clothing, houses and comforts, and luxuries of life which they

observe are so easily obtained by some others whom they justly begin to regard as specially privileged by law.

The strikes which so often end in bloodshed or in a sort of civil war are most deplorable because they prove that there are many workmen out of employment, and bidding against the employed. Unions are formed for the purpose of keeping wages up, of combating the tendency to reduction of pay owing to competition from outsiders for employment.

They attempt to do for labor what tariffs do for manufacturers, to shut off competition from the labor market, as customs-tariffs shut off competition of foreign merchandise.

The manufacturers have the law on their side and the power of the nations enforce it, while the trade unionists lacking the power are always exposed to the danger of failure.

The best thing for trade unionists is that the non-unionists (the unemployed) should be free to work for themselves, or that an increased demand for labor should lead to their employment. A tendency to advance wages would at once set in, for labor is like a commodity which advances in price when the demand is great and the supply small, but declines in price when the demand is small and the supply large.

The tendency of tariffs is to increase the prices of goods and thus to restrict the demand for them, and the demand for labor to supply them, thus lowering wages while at the same time the purchasing power of wages is lessened by the enhanced price of commodities. Instead of benefiting labor tariffs are injurious in every way, tending to reduce the demand for labor and the price of wages, and at the same time to increase the cost of living.

The discontent of the producing classes with their lot is taken advantage of by propagandists for socialism, who claim that competition is the cause of distress and advocate a policy of restriction or extreme protection for everybody and everything.

While most people are in favor of such a degree of socialism as will require representative management of the post and roads and schools, and some are in favor of State purchase and management of Railways, also there are many who object to State interference in vocations which can be conducted by private individuals and which are not of the nature of monopolies.

The present systems of taxation tend to develop some of the features of repressive or protective socialism, for they tax the industry of the community to pay for public services and improvements which enhance the value of the lands making this increased value a present to the ground-landlords in the vicinity.

This is perhaps a secondary evil in comparison with that of supplying an encouragement to landlords to hold valuable land on speculation, and thus prevent the employment of labor upon it. As men can only employ themselves on land and the supply of

land cannot be increased, the demand and the price depends upon how much is available for use.

If the annual taxation on land is less than the annual increase of value, it becomes profitable to hold it out of use. If however the taxation absorbs any increase of value imparted by the community, and owing to public improvements and growth of population and wealth, there is a double incentive to use land, because in proportion as taxation is upon land values, in like proportion is taxation removed from improvements and commodities.

The prosperity of a people is a good security for its peace.

Wars are usually the result of the discontent of some with what to them appears some matter of injustice or because some hope to benefit their material position.

Justice therefore is the great peace producer.

While tariff taxes benefit certain individuals at the expense of the community, the effect of all indirect taxation is equally one sided and generally injurious to the general public. The taxation of industry or of wealth in any form hinders labor and tends to poverty. The taxation of land values has the opposite tendency. It encourages people to use land to the best possible purpose, by removing the taxation and fines which are now visited on any who use or improve land. It makes the holding of land out of use an expensive luxury as much as it would be to reserve rooms at an hotel which one could not occupy.

The use of land implies the employment of labor which would be stimulated alike by the removal of taxes from industry, and the necessity enforced by the single tax compelling the use of land.

The increased demand for labor would cause an advance in wages, and in the general well-being of society. Unjust monopolies which are fostered by tariffs and the partial or complete exemption of land values from taxation would disappear, and with them also would vanish that abnormal wealth created by monopoly and the dreadful poverty caused by denying men the right to labor.

Strikes will be abolished when there are no unemployed competing for work, and when all men shall have equal opportunities for employing themselves. Trade unions will then emerge into purely friendly societies, and the union of workmen will become a real brotherhood with no blacklegs to make war on, for all will have work who desire it. The question of hours of labor will be naturally settled by every one for himself, when all his wants can be supplied by two, four, six or eight hours of labor a day. The peace of the world will be secured through the single tax which will abolish those tariffs, monopolies, and social injustices which legislate a few into great wealth but deprive the great majority of a large part of their earnings.

THE CHAIRMAN. A little time now remains for customary discussion. We have a lady upon the platform, Miss Catherine H. Spence, from Australia, from whom we should be glad to hear.

MISS SPENCE: The Rev. Washington Gladden says that over the portals of the crowded factories and the great workshops of a mighty city you see inscribed these words, "All love abandon ye who enter here." If within these walls there should be pandemonium, who could wonder? It seems strange that the arbitration and peace cause should crowd into two hours of a forenoon the mighty industrial question of peace or war. Because whatever we may say about the nations of the earth and their quarrels fearful as they are, that does not come home to American citizens as does the struggle between labor and capital. In Australia we have come down to bare rock. Our parties are the labor party and the capitalist party. The disastrous strikes of 1890 and 1891, all ending in the defeat, after a long struggle, of the strikers, has made me feel that the question of conciliation and arbitration is the great question for us all to take to heart.

My traditions are perhaps with the employing classes, and my sympathies are with the working classes. As an early colonist who went through the heat in early days in a colony which was not three years old when I landed in it, I know how to respect and honor that hard work which makes a nation.

Now when I found that labor and capital were going to be pitted against each other, as you Republicans and Democrats are, in each constituency in Australia, I abandoned my position as an occasional writer for that of a public speaker on any platform open to me, because if you continue this contention you get closer and closer organization, labor becomes more antagonistic against capital and capital against labor. Where capital is overpowered by numbers it is doomed to undermine by bribery. Where labor is undermined by bribery it is doomed to fight by force. Therefore conciliation is the great need, and I thought that if third parties, honest third parties were admitted, probably two or three members, they would moderate the extreme opinions of those who are all for capital and of those who are all for labor. Therefore I have been in my own land a missionary for property representation, which makes for peace. Our political systems are founded upon the old military system, victory for our country, right or wrong, victory for our party, right or wrong. Whereas under any system of equitable representation each voter does what he can without extinguishing the vote opposed to him. This is the co-operating system whereby everyone does his best towards making the Congress. I want to make you see that in the mere dual aspect of politics labor is absolutely excluded from your assemblies. I look in vain to see labor members and labor representatives in your Congress. We have them in the British House

of Commons. We have them in ever and ever increasing numbers in our Australian Legislatures. In all our Australian Legislatures there have been endeavors for establishing Courts of Conciliation, and none of them have been established as yet, except in New South Wales, where my friend, Dr. Garrin, is President of a Court of Conciliation, established during the last year. He told me, when I left Sidney, that many cases had been brought before him and several strikes averted. I myself believe in conciliation. The collective conscience of America will bear it out, I believe, as it has borne out the Massachusetts Board, and as the collective conscience of Massachusetts has borne out this Board, so it will bear out the Boards in other States. But to compel obedience I think unwise. I think too it is unnecessary. The voluntary Boards of Conciliation in England, in the North of England, Nottingham and other places, have made strikes all but unknown. Why? They have such confidence in the awards of their voluntary Boards that ships have gone to sea before it was settled what was to be paid for building them. There was a dispute while a ship was being built as to the terms. It was referred to the Court of Conciliation. There was so much evidence to take that the question could not be decided at once, but in the meantime the employers paid the same wages and the employees received them. If the award was against the employer, he had to make it good and pay the difference. If the award was against the employees they had to make it good and supply the difference for the term which they had been overpaid. Now what I want is to have this practised so successfully that it will be made universal, and it will only be made universal by applying to the collective conscience of the people and the collective conscience of common sense of the best employers and working men. (Applause.)

I am not young, but I hope to see the day when war will cease and when strikes, which are industrial wars, will also cease. What is it that Tennyson says? "When the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe, and the kindly earth shall slumber, wrapped in universal law." No, Tennyson, not quite slumber. The kindly earth shall prosper, shall advance, shall rise, and rise none the less effectively because everything has been sweetened, has been elevated, has been moralized all around.

My mission as an electoral reform advocate is not confined to Australia. I am ready to speak a word for it in America, too. If you take war out of politics, you will do more for the advancement of peace among nations, for the advancement of peace between employers and employed, for the advancement of peace all around than you will do perhaps by the strongest direct efforts you can make. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN : Moments are growing so precious that the Chair will feel called upon to strike the hammer at the end of five minutes.

ALFRED H. LOVE : In Philadelphia when the great strike was on we thought we would have a great deal of trouble, but in the evening of one day we submitted to the presidents of the roads and to the conductors and drivers of our cars just eleven rules. They were adopted before midnight, and we never had a car stop. It didn't cost us a dollar and the community were not inconvenienced. (Applause.)

Here are the eleven cardinal principles that have been adopted in a great many of the shops in Philadelphia.

1. First of all the employer shall have the right of selecting, without dictation, the person he employs.

2. The person seeking employment should have the right of seeking that employment wherever he believes his services will be best appreciated and rewarded.

3. The right to organization for beneficent purposes belongs to all alike, and where employer or employee belong to any particular organization it should be no obstacle to forming a labor contract.

4. Persons not members of an organization should have the right to seek employment and continue employment without molestation or interference by those connected with that organization.

5. Labor contracts made for a week, or month or longer period should be considered binding on employers and employees, to be amended, cancelled and renewed only with the consent of each contracting party.

6. Employers should not be required to abide by requests or laws of organizations in the consideration of which they have had no voice.

7. Due notice of any change in work or time affecting prices and labor and cessation of or discharge from employment should be given by the employer to the employed.

Due notice of leaving employment should be given to the employer by the employed.

8. Compulsion of any kind on the part of capital or labor is never conducive to the best interests of either.

9. Misunderstandings not otherwise adjustable should be submitted to a tribunal of arbitration and each contract should contain a clause providing therefor.

10. Pending the adjustment or arbitration of difficulties employers and employees should continue their relations as before, and any settlement not otherwise agreed upon should date from the beginning of the difficulty.

11. Corporations employing thousands of employees should recognize representatives selected by such employees.

These are the eleven rules. I believe I will not take any more time to explain them. They have been found sufficient in actual practice, and actions speak louder than words.

DR. DARBY: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—This is so essentially a new departure in our discussions, which have been usually confined to international questions, that I think that not all the voices that speak on this subject should have an American accent. I have long held that the principles which lie behind our questions of international peace and war are those which lie behind what has been commonly called industrial war, and I have hailed with a great deal of pleasure this section of our program. I think we ought always to be making new departures, if possible, in the discussion of our great question. I should like to point out that not only the underlying principles are the same in each instance, but the mode of procedure which we propose to apply to international disputes applies equally to those disputes, which we are now discussing, between sections of the community and between labor and capital. Mr. Love has just shown that capital and labor, instead of being at enmity, are indispensable to each other. That is the spirit behind the mode of arbitration which we want to apply. And it reminds me that that ancient epilogue which Dr. Boardman repeated in our hearing yesterday has a parallel in another sphere. Once upon a time there arose a great dispute between the ferns and the mosses that were growing around their roots. They grew impatient of each other's neighborhood. The mosses complained that the ferns overtopped them and shut out the sunshine and that all the attention was centred upon them, and the ferns complained that the mosses were consuming the moisture which ought to be their own, and the quarrel lasted for some time and grew to such an extent that they had to separate. The result was that the ferns, no longer supplied by the moisture of the earth, which was drunk up by the sunshine, very speedily withered away, and the mosses, deprived of the shade which was necessary to their growth, suffered a like experience, until at last they came to the conclusion that so far from being antagonistic to each other they were indispensable to each other's welfare, and so the ancient regime was again established, and the ferns and mosses grew in happy neighborhood and with mutual helpfulness. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we now cross the water from England to the continent and hear a few words from Sweden, from Mr. B. E. Hoeckert.

MR. HOECKERT: Ladies and Gentlemen — I am glad to be able to tell you that the majority of the people of Sweden are very good friends of peace. The majority of the people are not mak-

ing the laws in Sweden. It is only the few, the wealthy that are making the laws there. As soon as we try to do anything in the way of reform we always have to work against the rulers. The majority of the people love peace. A bill was introduced into the Swedish Parliament looking toward peace. In every factory and foundry the people had big meetings for this law. Once I was chairman of a meeting of two thousand people. We every one voted for the resolution, so I know that the majority of the Swedish people love peace.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from Dr. Mueller, of Sweden.

DR. MUELLER: Mr. President and Friends — I also favor Courts of Conciliation, but there is one chief obstacle in their way. It seems to me that as long as you have competitive institutions all your boards of conciliation will be only patchwork. In the competitive system of business people are compelled to act against their better nature, precisely as the soldier is obliged to kill; it is his duty to do so. And so it is the duty of a storekeeper to sell goods cheaper than his neighbor. This is so all over the world.

I am with you for doing everything possible to mend the evil by means of local boards of conciliation and State Boards of Arbitration but the only thing that will permanently cure this is co-operation. In England they have had splendid success with co-operation. If we look into wars, we will find they are caused often immediately through those antagonisms that arise in trade.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have one more three minute address from Mr. Alfred Cridge, of San Francisco.

MR. CRIDGE: Ladies and Gentlemen — I have little to say on this occasion except to state that I have for twenty-five years been an advocate of peace in all relations of life, international and otherwise, and that I have finally found that the greatest obstacle to peace is our system which Alfred Strickland, Counsellor at Law, New York, has aptly termed the Science of War by Election. Our political system is organized war, and while it exists all efforts in the direction of peace will be more or less hampered by that circumstance.

I also wish to say in regard to a remark by one of the earlier speakers that Justices of the Peace would be, if they were personally qualified, well suited to act as arbitrators in cases of disputes. I believe that some of them in the rural districts do so act with advantage. The speaker also correctly stated that the average caliber of Justices of the Peace was such as to disqualify them. And right there comes in the question of representation. If there were fifty Justices of the Peace in Chicago, and one-fift-

eth of the voters, especially if we had female suffrage, could send in one Justice of the Peace, and in that way have the whole People represented, I believe that Justices of the Peace would be secured of the requisite caliber mentally and morally to act in Courts of Arbitration, and instead of fees paid for promoting litigation they would be paid for preventing it, and the cultivation of the love of equity and of political principle in the masses of people would result in the selection of proper public officials, including judges; the choosing of judges in that manner would bring courts back to what one of the opening speakers stated when he claimed that in their inception courts were intended to be courts of conciliation. They have through corruption grown into this enormous practice of litigation with its immense cost,— a thing which did not belong to the original principle. I cordially agree with that expression of view, and if we had proportional representation we could carry it into effect and do away with this abuse of law. We could reduce our laws, in my opinion, ninety-nine per cent. if our law-makers were conversant with the first principles of equity. Ethical consideration is the first thing needed for our purpose. The courts of conciliation have shown that there is a great amount of equity in the nature of men, and that they abide by that without compulsion. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN : We shall now listen to a series of resolutions to be presented by the Business Committee, containing those thoughts that we trust will command universal assent, and starting from this platform may produce an effect throughout the world.

DR. TRUEBLOOD, on behalf of the Business Committee, then read the following resolutions, as expressive of the sentiment of the Congress on the principal subjects which had claimed its attention.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. The Congress has heard with sincere pleasure that a resolution has been introduced into the Senate of the United States authorizing the President to send a commission to other nations to open negotiations with a view to establishing a Permanent International Court of Arbitration; and profoundly convinced that such a tribunal will be an efficient means of averting war and promoting international friendliness, this Congress earnestly requests the Congress of the United States, by some such suitable resolution, to empower the President to take steps toward securing the organization among as many nations as will concur of a Permanent International Court of Arbitration.

2. This Congress expresses its sincere satisfaction that the United States Government has taken the lead in promoting the

formation of permanent treaties of arbitration by inviting each country with which it had diplomatic relations to join in signing the form of treaty recommended by the International American Conference of Washington. ✓

It also expresses great gratification that the British House of Commons has, with unanimity, signified its willingness to co-operate with the United States and it earnestly hopes that the President and Government of the United States will speedily take advantage of this circumstance by initiating the necessary proceedings for concluding a permanent treaty of arbitration between that country and Great Britain.

3. The Congress is of opinion that the treaty of 1817 between the United States and Great Britain, practically prohibiting the keeping of armed vessels on the great lakes and thus dedicating them to permanent peace, should be faithfully maintained, and sincerely hopes that no infraction thereof may be attempted by either nation. It further appeals to the press of both countries to use its great influence in behalf of the maintenance of this important treaty.

4. Inasmuch as animosities often arise, and wars are thereby engendered, between peoples on account of differences of nationality; and inasmuch as nationality does not depend on locality or consist in language or race or tradition alone, and is by its very nature a principle which is not capable of precise determination; and, further, inasmuch as beneath all accidental and artificial differences men are united by a common humanity whose solidarity and brotherhood are undeniable facts;

This Congress is of opinion that no sentiment of nationality or patriotism should be allowed to contravene those sentiments and sympathies which lie deep in the natural constitution of the human race or to be cultivated at their expense;

And convinced that it is the violation of this principle which frequently renders war possible, it therefore urges upon the friends of peace the duty of opposing the cultivation of all sentiments which divide men from each other by sectional and selfish considerations, and of seeking to establish the natural unity and brotherhood of men as the basis of society and the principle of international relations and intercourse; and to this end that they should specially direct their attention to the elucidation of those subtle causes of hostility and war which lie in the temper and disposition of nations towards one another, and to those means by which the spirit of fraternity and charity may be promoted, not only between individuals, but also among nations, and between all sections of communities.

5. The Congress desires to express great satisfaction at the growth and spread of peace sentiments in many countries, as evidenced by the rapid increase in the number of peace societies, by the success already attained, especially in Denmark, Switzerland

and England, in the way of a universal peace petition recommended at the Berne Congress in 1892, and by the nearly victorious vote cast, in the late German elections, against the further increase of armaments, with their attendant disastrous burdens on the people.

The Congress at Chicago extends its sincerest sympathy to the friends of peace on the other side of the Atlantic, who, in their respective countries, are laboring so earnestly and self-sacrificingly to remedy the present deplorable state of armed distrust and to deliver themselves from the devouring scourge of militarism.

6. In the opinion of this Congress it is the duty of the Peace Bureau and the Peace Societies, whenever complications arise between nations which might eventually lead to war, to investigate the circumstances without delay, and to use every legitimate influence to bring about a better understanding between the governments involved, with a view to a peaceable and equitable adjustment of the difficulty.

7. The Congress welcomes the formation of an International Universities Committee, recently organized at Paris, as an important step toward enlisting the co-operation of educational institutions and forces in the work of peace. It is of opinion that it is most desirable that there should be such a revision of manuals of instruction as will eliminate false and misleading representations of the nature of war, and inculcate the true principles lying at the basis of social order, and which should govern the nations in their relations one to another; and it further expresses the wish that there should be established in the universities departments for instruction in the principles of international unity and concord.

8. The Congress, heartily approving the work of the Ecclesiastical Peace Conference, represented by Dr. W. A. Campbell and his associates, in endeavoring to secure memorials from all Christian organizations to the governments of the civilized nations in behalf of arbitration, earnestly appeals to the Christian Churches everywhere to give their hearty and undivided support to this special work, and also to use the great influence which God has given them in promoting the permanent peace of the world.

9. Considering the present incomplete and often contradictory statistical accounts found in circulation as to the size of standing armies and the cost in various ways of war and preparations for war, the Congress invites the peace societies to furnish to the International Peace Bureau at Berne as accurate statistics as can be obtained in their several countries, in order to facilitate the study of the destructiveness and economic waste of war.

The reading of the resolutions was attended with repeated applause, and they were accepted without opposition.

The following persons, proposed by the Committee, were appointed a Commission to have an interview with the President of

the United States and, if it should seem advisable, with the Committees on Foreign Relations of the two Houses of Congress, to encourage the taking of steps at an early date, for the negotiation of a Permanent Treaty of Arbitration between Great Britain and the United States, as referred to in the Second Resolution: Hon. Robert Treat Paine, chairman, Edward Everett Hale, Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey, Alfred H. Love, Dr. Philip S. Moxom, Dr. A. A. Miner, Dr. George Dana Boardman, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Mr. B. Schlesinger, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood and Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood.

As a Committee to co-operate with committees of other Congresses, in accordance with the request received from the Suffrage Congress, the following were named: Mrs. Amanda Deyo, Rev. H. S. Clubb, Mary Louise Thomas, Mr. G. FitzGerald, and Mr. John J. Cornell.

DR. TRUEBLOOD also announced, on behalf of the Business Committee, that on account of the press of business and for lack of proper information, it had been impossible to make up the Committee on an International Court of Arbitration suggested in the paper of Messrs. Butler, Brainerd and Eaton on Thursday. The Committee was to consist of jurists and publicists and eminent men in different countries who have taken an interest in the subject of International Arbitration. Hon. Wm. Allen Butler, who was the chairman of the committee who prepared the plan for an International Arbitration Court brought forward on Thursday, had been chosen to act as Chairman of that Committee. Further than that, a committee of three had been named, consisting of Dr. W. Evans Darby, Alfred H. Love and Benjamin F. Trueblood who should complete this Committee and publish it in the proceedings of the Congress.

There being no objection, the Committees were appointed as proposed.

DR. DARBY: As you have heard, we have now come to the close of our proceedings. There is a charm in beginnings. There is often a mournfulness about endings, but if the ending becomes itself a beginning it carries with it the impulse which shall drive us forward into the new way. We must now go and put into practice in our different spheres of activity all that can be so applied of our discussions during the week. It has been exceedingly pleasing to me to form here new acquaintances. We are to each other henceforth more than names, and when information shall come across the sea either way from you to us, or to you from us who are working in this great cause on the other side of the sea, words which carry the information will have a fresh meaning and will be mirrors in which we shall see each other's faces.

I want to say that, in my judgment, this task of ours, covering as it does not only international questions and international rela-

tionships but all the relationships of human life, is the greatest work that is to be done in this age. It is a marvellous age, and one often thanks Providence for being permitted to live and work in it. But after eighteen centuries of the Christian faith and preaching the Christian world is to-day still military. Militarism is the dominant factor of the old world, at least. To remove this huge curse resting upon our modern world is certainly one of the greatest tasks that can fill the hand and rest upon the heart of man. The tendencies of the times are with us; the promises of the future are with us, the upward striving of humanity, the glorious strife of responsible natures everywhere is with us.

It is now my duty to move a resolution, which, although it is the mere fulfilment of a duty, will express our earnest sentiments.

Those who have had the arrangements for a Congress of this kind appreciate the immense help which has been furnished by the President of the World's Congress Auxiliary and those who are associated with him, in what they have done for us. There have been some restrictions, it may be. They have not given us any great inconvenience, and our Secretary has had the ingenuity to get over the main difficulty arising from these restrictions in the very last act of the Congress. We are deeply indebted to the World's Congress Auxiliary and to its President, Judge Bonney, for their assistance in this Congress.

As a journalist I can in some sense comprehend the immense difficulty that the press reporters have had, and I therefore appreciate the kindness and consideration which they have shown to this Congress and its proceedings, in what they have reported. I believe the discussions of this Congress, at any rate the questions which we have discussed, if not the actual discussions, are more important than those of any other Congress which has been held. We have had this help from the press, and through the press we have been addressing a world-wide audience, and as a visitor to your city I have great pleasure in moving the following resolutions:

1. That the hearty thanks of this Congress be expressed to the Hon. Charles C. Bonney and the World's Congress Auxiliary for their great kindness in extending to us the free use of these halls and for the many courtesies and favors received from them during the sittings of the Peace Congress.

2. That the sincere thanks of the Congress be also extended to the press of Chicago and to the reporters for the fairness and fulness with which they have reported the proceedings of our meetings.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard this motion. All in favor please manifest. Carried unanimously.

MR. LOVE: Mr. President and Good Friends—I want to express, as we close, my very profound satisfaction, indeed, my

exultation over the success of the Fifth International Peace Congress. I have a little duty that I did not propose to the Committee on resolutions, simply because some of those to whom reference is made were members of that Committee. I beg to present the following resolutions :

1. That our gratitude is due to the Peace Societies of Europe and elsewhere for their co-operation and especially to those that have sent Delegates to this Congress, and we acknowledge with sincere pleasure the strength and encouragement that have been afforded by their presence and by their able and interesting presentation of the progress of the peace movement.

2. That when the Peace Societies of America appointed Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood to be Chairman of the Committee on Organization, it was scarcely realized that the duties devolving upon him would be so onerous as they have proved, but it is exceedingly gratifying to have had, in a marked manner in the numerous sessions of the Congress, the evidence of his judicious management and we feel it eminently proper to present to him the thanks of the Congress.

THE CHAIRMAN : Those who are in favor of the resolutions will kindly raise their hands. Carried unanimously.

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, the Chairman, then said :

I believe this closes the ceremonies and the speeches of to-day. It is a painful office to draw this Congress to a close, and yet it is the great privilege of my life that I may say a few words to you on this occasion. With great pleasure we have welcomed to this Congress representatives from England, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, Denmark, from Australia, India, China and Africa. This Congress with these representatives surely denotes progress. The glory of this Congress is that it rests upon the great truth that ideas are supreme. Only a few words I am going to say, but if time were longer I should like to develop that idea. We must cleanse the human mind of a great deal of débris that has come down in it. We want to change the schools, the colleges, the whole system of instruction, that it may be no longer taught to boys and girls in their tender years that war is the glory of life. (Applause.) The pride and pomp and circumstance of war are illustrated by these beautiful banners, which adorn this hall and which have a little flavor of human blood. They all need to be remounted upon that white back-ground that denotes purity and universal peace. I said the other day that to me it seemed as if the great Fair at the other end of the city was a declaration of Independence in American art. These Congresses seem to me to be inspired by this great idea, the elevation, the uplifting of the masses of mankind. (Applause.) It would have perhaps been happier if the two, the Fair and the Congresses, could have been brought more closely into connection, and if these Con-

gresses, probably over one hundred, representing all varieties of human interest, could have met in the middle of that wonderful collection of the works of art and human industry.

But at any rate the ideas which you have heard in this Congress illustrate the same wonderful development of the human race, which you go down there to see proved by what the hand of man has done. What a contrast is suggested by a story told me, years ago in Spain, which sent the discoverer to this country, in the little town of Algeciras just opposite Gibraltar. In an old tower stands a clock which has upon its face the means of showing the phases of the moon, as well, of course, as the hours of the day. Spain regarded the man who made that clock as a magician, and putting out his eyes confined him in a dungeon for the rest of his life. Men did not believe then as Dr. Holmes, I think it is, has taught us, that truth is such a sturdy boy that if he falls out of the window he is well again and out in a week, while error is such a puny sickling that if you scratch him with a pin he dies presently of gangrene. (Applause.)

This Congress rejoices to have met at last upon the soil of America, and I know I may, on behalf of all Americans who have shared in its work, express the hearty welcome which we have given to the Congress and to the grand ideas for which this movement stands.

If we Americans seek to make the influence of our country powerful among the nations, it is with no selfish or ulterior design. Nay we delight to know that the chief source of this great and growing influence springs from this fact of pre-eminent power, which may be stated with those noblest words ever spoken on this continent, by the greatest American of this century, Abraham Lincoln, that this country regards other countries "with malice toward none, with charity for all."

NO NATIONAL ANIMOSITIES.

This thought leads me to ask you to think for an instant of another privilege this nation enjoys, of inconceivable value to it, and also therefore to the world; freedom from national animosities, a rare and wonderful national heritage. Think of our relations with five great nations of the world, ancient friendship for the French, our earliest friends in the Revolutionary War; our proverbial friendship for Russia, growing perhaps out of mutual size but otherwise as unintelligible as it is yet well established; our sympathetic and unbroken friendship for Germany, our admiration for Italy and last our relations with England, the noble motherland of whom we are so proud, and towards whom the various collisions of a hundred years have left at last only the genuine and solid affection of a powerful offspring, conscious of the strength of full grown manhood and almost enjoying in memory the struggles of its youth.

What a glorious heritage Americans thus enjoy, for their own progress and the good of the world! Inconceivable folly and wickedness to exchange it for any miserable mess of pottage which war might offer!

Here lie in large measure the danger and the shame, let me say the crime, against our fair heritage of international respect and love growing out of our nation's treatment of Chile and Italy and China in these last few years.

Here lay the supreme danger of embittered dispute, with the possibility of the unspeakable calamity of a collision and so of protracted hate, if the more recent disputes with England, touching the Alabama, the fisheries and the seals, had not all been determined by arbitrations which have cemented more closely the friendship of these great nations for each other.

The strength and glory of these solemn adjudications between the two nations are that first, they do justice, second, that the settlements are accepted as decisive, and third, I believe the time has come when a large part of the enlightened citizens of each land delight in the consciousness of not obtaining what the nation is not entitled to enjoy.

This peerless position of the United States of America in its freedom from any national hatred leads me to a subject which I believe no Peace Congress has ever dared approach—a matter wherein lies the chiefest obstacle to the peace of Europe and the world. I refer of course to the bitter hostility of France and Germany, resulting from the fierce wars of centuries and especially from the war of 1870 which left Germany in possession of two fair provinces, Alsace and Lorraine, torn from France defeated and embittered.

From that time the burden of armaments and the spirit of militarism have steadily increased in both Germany and France, drawing other nations of Europe into the same maelstrom of ruin, till the curse to all the nations involved and the crime against God and mankind have grown so flagrant that they cry aloud in the face of the whole civilized world.

Perhaps the worst of it all is that there is no end to the increase of the burden and the crime, by the present road. Some other way of exit must be found. The hatred and bitterness of France only bide their time for cruel war of revenge and hoped recovery. Germany is too brave to fear, but we may remind her that the long roll of time may find her at such disadvantage that France and perhaps Russia may conquer some bloody gain, and so more tremendous war preparations again begin.

The peace of the world, especially of the great military nations of Europe, demand that Alsace and Lorraine be neutralized by universal consent and that then and thereafter France and Germany cease their hatred and preparations for war, with a neutral

zone established between their boundaries, which both nations will in good faith agree to respect.

Some such consummation can alone put an end to the war spirit and war preparation of Europe. Will not every friend of peace among men strive to promote such peaceful issue to the present war furor in Germany and France?

Listen to a few words from a staunch friend of Peace in the English House of Commons, Hon. James Stansfeld: "The condition of Europe, with its armed States, is becoming absolutely intolerable. But a light is being forced from behind the clouds; a perfect revolution in the idea of war is being developed. The question is this: Is the future to be law or war? Are belligerents or neutrals to make the law of the future? Is war the natural state of nations? Or is not rather the condition of Peace the natural state? Is there to be constant international anarchy or shall we organize the nations into a civilized society of nations? An organization is wanted capable of creating and enforcing international law."

No wonder then that the plan of arbitration of the Pan-American Congress opens with the solemn declaration that "War is the most cruel, the most fruitless and the most dangerous expedient for the settlement of international differences."

This is the conviction which has rested deep in the conscience and the intelligence of the American people in these recent years. The United States have taken vigorous action towards the creation, first of special treaties of arbitration, then of a system of arbitration, and the air is now vibrating with the thought of a High Court of Arbitration to produce peace among all nations who are parties to its creation. A resolution looking to this result has been introduced into the Senate of the United States and a committee created by this Congress will be created to urge its consideration and acceptance by the world.

The action of this Congress on Thursday in offering to your consideration a scheme for a High Court of Arbitration will promote this most desirable result.

Because truth is mighty and the cause of justice must prevail under the providence of God, even so we may feel sure that this great cause in which we have rejoiced to labor, to hasten the day when a High Court may keep the peace among nations, will surely prevail and causes of war grow fewer and the brotherhood of man be a felt power in the earth.

There only remains for me to declare that this Fifth International Congress of Peace and Arbitration is now closed.

(As this Report goes to press the Committee on an International Arbitration Court, spoken of on page 295, has not been quite completed. It will shortly be announced in the public press.)

SUNDAY SERVICE.

HALL OF WASHINGTON.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 20TH, 10.30 A. M.

The exercises were opened with prayer by Rev. W. A. Campbell, D. D. of Richmond, Va., and with appropriate singing. Rev George Dana Boardman, D. D., who presided, read suitable Scripture selections and uttered a few opening sentences expressed in weighty and inspiring words.

Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D. D., of Boston, was then introduced and preached the following sermon on

THE SOCIAL AND MORAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

"And he shall speak peace unto the nations."—Zech. 9 : 10.

A persistent element in the world-ideal of the greatest Hebrew prophets was peace among all nations. It is an interesting fact that the rule of the peaceful Solomon, and not the rule of the great soldier David, furnished the type of national glory upon which the minds of succeeding generations loved most to dwell and which gave form to their prophetic forecast.

Equally is universal peace a main feature of the world-ideal which Christianity presents. As, in the conception of the olden prophet, the Messiah was to speak peace unto the nations, so, in the conception of New Testament apostle and seer, the Christ is to bring "peace on earth and good will among men."

Modern scientific altruism agrees with Hebrew and Christian prophecy in its prognostication of universal peace. The philosophy of evolution, in which the element of conflict fills so large a place, as it passes to the moral plane, speaking through the poet Tennyson, bids man

"Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the ape and tiger die."

From the religious, from the ethical, and from the scientific point of view, an invincible logic leads us forward in thought to a time when war will cease to be a possible condition of profit or progress, and humanity will attain unto universal peace realized through universal co-operation under the benign and sovereign law of love.

To the superficial observer, indeed, as he looks out upon the modern world with its vast military and naval equipment, and sees

the nations armed to the teeth, and maintaining a system of conscription that makes almost every able bodied man, at least in Europe, a soldier, humanity seems far enough from the ideal. Never was military science so highly developed, never were weapons of offence and defence so powerful and deadly, and never were the destructive possibilities of war so enormous as now. And yet never was there a time when the friends of peace had such large and solid reasons for encouragement and hope as they have to-day. The very multiplication and perfection of the means for destroying life, as has often been pointed out, is accomplishing this good result, of impressing upon all but the most stolid minds the utter madness and wickedness of war.

During the last twenty years there has been rapid progress towards the permanent establishment of international peace. The change in the material situation by the increased application of scientific discovery and intelligence to the art of war, which to many people seems so marked a change for the worse, is more than offset by the great change in the economic and moral situation. The present condition of Christendom with respect to the question of war is better than it seems. While military experts have been applying the latest conclusions of science to the development of military art, many experts in morals have been applying the conclusions of ethical inquiry to international relations. Meantime the people have been slowly awakening to the real significance of war. There is more serious and more widely-extended reflection on the wastefulness and immorality of war. In increasing numbers men are questioning the necessity and reasonableness of the appeal to arms. They are beginning to suspect that what they have heretofore accepted as a normal feature of human life is abnormal and monstrous because at last it has been outgrown. The recent action of the British Parliament in unanimously passing a resolution in favor of meeting the friendly overtures of the American government with respect to the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration is significant of a great change which is rapidly taking place in the public mind.

The two governments in their action are reflecting the popular conviction and confirming the popular judgment. It is interesting to remember that Mr. Cremer, Sir John Lubbock and the English Peace Society have urged this resolution on Parliament for many years, and, at last, the House of Commons has awakened to the discovery "that what had previously been declared to be impossible, unconstitutional and most inexpedient, has now become so obviously desirable that not a single hostile vote could be registered against the motion."

Is not this the beginning of the realization of that dream which has haunted prophetic minds among peace men for many years—the establishment of a Universal High Court of Arbitration through which war is to be finally abolished?

At last war is on the defensive. It has reached the apologetic stage. Its old assurance and arrogance are passing away. Even military budgets, once so popular, must now be excused to the people, and the main argument urged in their favor is the necessity of preserving peace. Conquest, extension of territory and glory even have lost their spell.

The principal arguments by which war is now defended—it is no longer advocated—are:

(1) *Its antiquity.* Men say war always has been, therefore it must always be. The inanity of the argument is too apparent. Once small-pox and the cholera took their unobstructed way through communities and continents; but intelligence and care have almost extirpated the former, and the latter is rapidly losing its terrors.

For long ages slavery cursed the human race; to-day it maintains a precarious existence only among savage or barbarous peoples. Duelling, which was for centuries a recognized means of avenging affronts to honor and settling disputes between man and man, has ceased to be reputable, is branded by civil law in most countries as a crime, and has ceased to exist save rarely in a few exceptional communities. War has lingered long, and may linger still, but it too is doomed to extinction.

(2) But, it is urged that *human nature* will of necessity perpetuate war. Men will always be subject to uncontrollable passion. Selfishness and hatred—greed of gain and lust of power—will always dominate.

But this is to ignore or deny the moral progress of the species. The error of the older economists was their assumption that selfishness is the strongest, the most persistent and the only stable motive to human action. But strong as selfishness is, it is weaker than love. Surely, if slowly, men are learning that they are bound together by ties which cannot be broken without loss and suffering to all. The real gain of each is the gain of all.

What is true of the family and the community is true of the nation; and, we are beginning to see, it is true also of the race. No nation can gain permanently at the expense of another nation.

History is the record of human progress. The progress has not been uniform. There are eddies and back-currents in the stream. But age by age humanity advances. The average of human nature is higher to-day than at any time in the past. Men are steadily growing less cruel, less bestial and less selfish.

Once war was the chronic, we might even say the normal, condition of humanity. Now it confessedly is exceptional. Once a vocation, now it is, at most, an avocation. Once a daily regimen, it is now an extreme and critical measure like a surgical operation.

Everything points to its ultimate abandonment. Once nations

were natural and instinctive enemies to each other; now they are bound together by a thousand ties of mutual knowledge, commerce, industry, science, education and charity. Men in the mass are becoming more humane. National antipathies have disappeared or have lost their ancient strength.

(3) A third and favorite argument in defence of war is the claim that there is no power, save the military power, to guarantee the fulfilment of treaties. Civil law has its sanctions in police and courts and prisons; so international law must have its sanctions in armies and navies.

But this argument ignores the truth that the real guaranties of civil law are moral rather than material. The peace of a community is preserved by the moral sentiment of the majority. The public conscience has far greater force than police and military combined. This conservative force, inhering in the intelligence and moral sense of the people, grows stronger continually.

The disposition of men to trust the corporate man, that is, the community or the nation, for the maintenance and protection of their rights, increases with the development of civilization.

We have but to broaden our application of the principle which we daily see to be operative in the narrow sphere of the nation, to the family of nations. The union of the nations in a treaty of arbitration and peace which shall create an International Court, would rapidly develop an international consciousness like that national consciousness which now underlies the daily life and preserves the internal order of each individual nation.

The peaceful adjudication of international differences would soon become a habit.

Already the practice of arbitration has been carried so far between England and the United States that the suggestion of war between these two countries would be treated as absurd by the vast majority of those people on both sides of the Atlantic who form public sentiment and shape public action.

The influence of the example set by the English-speaking nations must be far-reaching and powerful.

(4) But it is urged finally, that *readiness for war insures peace: si vis pacem, para bellum*. There is a certain plausibility in this contention that hides its deep-lying fallacy. Once it was true. It is still true, perhaps, of those civilized communities that border on savage tribes. The show of brute force affects the brutal mind. But of the nations of Christendom it is no longer true. In a civilized community no man needs to carry weapons of defence to insure the respect of his neighbors and prevent them from encroaching on his rights.

We do not keep muskets stacked in the front halls of our dwellings and gatling guns mounted at our windows. In all this broad land there is not a city that has fortifications and armed

sentries. There is no more real necessity for forts and camps bristling with rifles along the frontiers of European countries than there is for a cordon of troops around this building. Do not think me extravagant. I say "*real necessity.*"

Why should Frenchmen and Germans hold themselves ready to blow out each other's brains? There are bitter memories still alive, and "Alsace" and "Lorraine" still exert an ominous spell over the minds of many in both nations. But that spell is kept active and powerful by the proximity of French and German armies. Readiness for war, instead of insuring peace, is a constant provocative of war. Huge standing armies perpetuate and nourish the martial spirit.

The possession of powerful weapons, such as the modern war-ships carry, is almost inseparable from a temptation to use them. Of what earthly use are these floating fortresses and colossal guns save for the hellish purpose of destroying human lives? Of what use are vast armies of economically unproductive men, drilled and uniformed and armed, save for the purpose of butchering each other in the shortest possible time? War is the *raison d'être* of the soldier. The "piping times of peace" are abhorrent to him, save as he is much more a citizen than a soldier, and then the enforced idleness or fruitless activity of military life are unspeakably irksome to him.

In the present stage of human progress the true maxim is "If you desire peace, prepare for peace."

Consider what would be the effect of a general European disarmament? It would practically make war impossible. It would dispel the temptation to national disagreements. It would remove the irritable susceptibility which standing armies in close proximity to each other inevitably create. It would permit the natural and easy intercommunication of adjacent peoples, and let the peaceful and beneficent impulses of social and commercial interchange weave nation to nation in ties of mutual good-will and profit. When men cannot fight they seldom wish to fight. Power almost inevitably carries with it the disposition to use power. If the great Nations of Europe would consent to a mutual reduction of armies to a merely police footing, war would be eliminated from the possibilities of the future.

The impracticability of such a step lies only in the difficulty which inheres in a long continued and traditional way of thinking. If peoples can be brought to see that the right thing is always both the practicable and the profitable thing, they will throw away their military equipments as long ago men threw away the sword and pistol which once were a part of every gentleman's habitual dress.

Let us now consider, somewhat in detail,

1. THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

The more familiar social results of war I may pass over with a few words. Of the horrors of war in its destruction of human lives and all the frightful sequence of physical suffering and mental anguish, I need not speak here. The picture cannot be overdrawn. History is full of the awful tragedy. Let those who would know the ghastly reality read Baroness Von Suttner's *Die Waffen Nieder* ("Lay down your Arms") or Emile Zola's *La Débâcle* ("The Smash Up"). The former is much the better, since its *motif* is nobler, but either one will give to the inexperienced mind an impression of the prosaic and actual aspect of war which never can be forgotten.*

From the social point of view war is evil, and only evil.

1. Because it is, to the last extreme, *economically wasteful*.

In the *first* place, it causes immense destruction of economic values. Aside from the enormous consumption of agricultural and mechanical products incident to the support of troops in camp or in the field, there is always a great amount of sheer destruction caused by the operations of armies both on the march and in battle. Conflagration accompanies war as its inseparable companion. The country which is the scene of a military campaign is wasted and desolated as if it had been swept by furies. Farms and vineyards, granaries and orchards, factories and villages are trampled and shattered and consumed. Harvests are left ungathered or are reaped by sickles of flame. Cattle and sheep are slaughtered or dispersed beyond recovery. Horses are drafted into the service of death and perish miserably with their drivers or riders. In the economic waste the victors suffer only less than the vanquished. There is nothing more frightful than a great victory, save a great defeat. Always there is loss. That is the one constant feature of a modern war. And, in almost every case, it is loss without compensating gain.

In the *second* place there is economic waste in the abstraction from the countries engaged in strife of vast productive force. A million men in arms are a million workers removed from the cultivation of the soil and the mechanic arts. Even in time of peace the army is a constant and heavy drain on the productive energies of a nation; for thousands of artisans must idle in camps or spend in drill the strength that would enrich communities with industrial products.

It is true that certain kinds of industry are stimulated by war. Factories for the manufacture of weapons and ammunition and the various materials necessary to military equipment do a thriving business, but almost their entire product is destined to speedy destruction. But while these industries are stimulated the benefi-

*Another, and still more powerful book than either of the above, is Count Tolstoi's "Peace and War."

cent arts of peace which make for a nation's prosperity and moral advantage inevitably languish. The condition of a nation engaged in war ceases to be normal and healthful. It is like that of the human body which a serious wound fills with fever. The natural and healthy functions of every organ are disturbed. With every day of war the nation grows poorer and weaker.

In the *third* place there is economic waste in the derangement of public finance and the costly accumulation of debt to burden succeeding generations with heavy taxes on all forms of industry. The workers of the world to-day are giving a large percentage of their annual product to pay the interest on the cost of past folly and crime in the shape of needless wars. The National Debts of eighteen European States in 1891, amounted to about five thousand million pounds sterling, or 24,350 million dollars, the great proportion of which huge sum has been incurred, directly or indirectly, by war. The interest on these debts amounts to 220 million pounds, or 1,071,400,000 dollars. The world is poorer by many billions of dollars and lower by many degrees in the scale of economic advancement than it would have been but for wars.

2. But war is not only economically wasteful, it is also *politically evil*. With rare possible exceptions it obstructs the progress of popular freedom. War is the natural accompaniment and ally of despotism. The military spirit and habit are hostile to that free exercise of individual judgment and free play of individual action which are necessary to the best political life.

In spite of wars and conscriptions the nations have advanced in political liberty, but their advance has been retarded or made unspeakably costly by a widespread and despotic militarism.

Free men make the best soldiers, it is true ; but soldiers do not, save rarely, make the best free men.

War has overthrown many a political constitution. Republics that become possessed of the military spirit invite the dictatorship that ends in monarchy.

3. War is obstructive of the social integration of humanity through which it obtains its highest development.

Let me pause here to state explicitly what has been implied in this entire discussion. We must discriminate between war as an exceptional and extreme act of self defence, and war as the result and expression of a deep-rooted and long cultivated disposition. The military spirit and habit find their natural and logical expression in wars of aggression for the sake of gain in wealth or territory or power. Most wars are of the latter class. Most revolutions have been struggles for self-preservation against the encroachments of tyranny supported by force of arms.

Our contention is against war, as an institution, the inevitable product of the military spirit. War, thus defined, is always and everywhere obstructive of social progress. A war may seem,

incidentally, to aid social progress by producing changes which liberate social forces previously latent, but this is much like the contribution to a man's wealth which fire makes when it consumes his house by revealing gold that had been secreted in its walls. Human society advances in spite of the obstructing and demoralizing influences of military conflict. War thrives on national antipathies. It intensifies that national selfishness which makes nations Ishmaelites, every one with its hand against its fellow.

The natural and normal tendency of mankind is toward unity of thought and interest and action. Human progress is advancement toward the realization of this unity throughout the entire race. It does not involve the destruction of national individuality any more than the unity of the family involves the destruction of the individuality of its members. The law of the universe is diversity in unity. The individual man completes himself in the unity of the family; the family completes itself in the unity of the nation; and the nation completes itself in the unity of mankind. "The Parliament of man, the federation of the world" is not the mere dream of a poet, but the certain goal of a great and inevitable sociological tendency and movement. "God hath made of one [family] every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The real history of man reveals a two-fold process going on slowly from the beginning of his existence. On the one hand is the process of individualization by which is produced an ever finer and higher, and more distinct type of the individual soul. Savages are much alike, as cattle in a herd. They are gregarious as are cattle. Civilized men are not gregarious but social, that is, companionable, through intellectual and moral affinities; but they are individualized so that their diversity is enormously increased. Each man is more significant and of higher value in the scale of being.

On the other hand is the process of integration, by which is produced a higher collective life that expresses itself in a complex and coherent social organization. Society is the product of the intellectual and moral development of men. It is not the result of congenital or geographical relations, but of spiritual affinities which spring from the universal unifying force of love. God is love. The unity of man is in God, the infinite Life that animates and sustains all.

The tendency toward a closer social unity of mankind which we see working in thousand fold ways—in international commerce and charity, in interchange of literatures, and in the ever increasing number of political, ethnological, social and religious Congresses,—is but the working of the universal force of spiritual gravitation by which the multifiform life of humanity is drawn to its true centre and unity in God, and which is to culminate in the final perfect social organization of the race in the Kingdom of God.

War, the product of selfishness, promotes as well as expresses selfish and destructive antagonisms. It rudely cuts the filaments of interest and good will which bind peoples together. It segregates when naturally men would unite, and so retards the divine beneficent process of social integration by which the nations of the earth are to be bound in a universal brotherhood of mutual love and service.

The philosophy of evolution, which approaches the problem of human life from the purely scientific side, while accounting for wars in the past, interpreting them on the material plane as features of the struggle for existence through which the fittest survive, logically points to the abolition of war.

The moment we pass up from the material plane to the moral, the evolution takes on new phases. On the higher plane it is the morally fittest that survive, and the morally fittest survive not by destruction but by conservation, that is by service. The strong protect the weak so that the weak become strong. Man climbs not by pushing down his rival but by lifting him up, so that both mount together.

From the social point of view, then, war is evil and only evil. It destroys or hinders the largest products of industry, and is therefore economically wasteful. It represses the instincts of freedom and retards the progress of civil liberty, and is therefore politically evil. It checks the great social tendency towards the integration and unity of the nations of the world in a common life of mutual good will and mutual helpfulness, and is therefore socially maleficent.

II. THE MORAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

These are more serious than the social aspects of war, considered from the economic or scientific point of view. Indeed, the two are not separable, save in thought. So much of the moral aspect has been involved in the preceding discussion that I need dwell on it now but a few minutes.

Some one has suggested that there is always a ludicrous element in evil.

This is because evil is in the last degree unreasonable, that is, in so far as it is the direct product of human choice.

The humorist cannot read the history of man without sometimes feeling the absurdity of much human action so deeply as to wonder whether even the gods do not indulge at times in Cyclopean laughter.

How often poor man has pulled his helmet or military cap over his eyes, and straightway played the fool on a colossal scale. Ah, but the pity of it is that his folly is provocative of tears and groans instead of mirth. There is a vast absurdity in war. Recall those words of Titanic sarcasm in "Sartor Resartus":

“What, speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net purport and upshot of War? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge, usually some five hundred souls. From these, by certain ‘Natural Enemies’ of the French, there are successively selected, during the French War, say thirty able-bodied men; Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red; and shipped away, at the public charges, some two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain; and fed there till wanted. And now to that same spot in the south of Spain, are thirty similar French artisans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxtaposition; and Thirty stands fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand; straightway the word ‘Fire’ is given; and they blow the souls out of one another; and in place of sixty brisk, useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcasses, which it must bury, and anew shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their Governors had fallen out; and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot. Alas, so it is in Deutschland, and hitherto in all lands; still as of old, ‘What devilry soever Kings do, the Greeks must pay the piper!’”

In the vast majority of cases the unprejudiced and clear-seeing observer must affirm that war is unnecessary and futile. In view of its character and its tragic results it is therefore immoral. It can justify itself at all only by producing benefits that are greater than the evils it has wrought. Failing to do this it is immoral and utterly condemnable.

Now in the *first* place war is directly opposed to the law of love. “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” is a fundamental principle of rational ethics. Love never works harm; it seeks and accomplishes only good. But war, if not the expression of hatred between the contending nations, rapidly develops hatred that is passionate and pitiless. Meanwhile in its every stage it works harm to all concerned. In a word war unjustified by a clear moral necessity, is murder, robbery and arson on a colossal scale. It is indiscriminating murder. The innocent suffer with the constructively guilty, and often the innocent suffer the most.

In the *second* place, war is enormously prolific of vices and crimes. Cruelty, drunkenness and licentiousness thrive in camp

and field, and spread like a contagious disease through communities that are infected by the presence of armies. Long after armies are disbanded the bad product survives and perpetuates itself. Always the morality of civil life is lowered by a war, and at its close, and long after, criminal statistics show a marked increase.

Military life promotes an appalling carelessness of human life and great disregard of rights in property. Often the forager becomes a thief. Unquestionably there has been vast improvement in military discipline in recent times and the property and lives of non-combatants are much safer now than in former times. But the best that can be said is that there has been a reduction of the evils incident to war. Those evils cannot be wholly abated while war continues to be the means of settling international differences.

As long as men in uniform are licensed to kill and rob and burn, so long will there be a baleful overflow of destructive force, and many men out of uniform will continue the habits of vice and crime once formed under the assumed exigencies of military campaigns.

In one word, then, let it be said plainly, that war contradicts the fundamental principles of morality, often stunts or destroys the noblest virtues, promotes the worst vices, and retards the moral progress of the species.

But it is said that war certainly promotes virtues, such as courage and fortitude and self-sacrifice. This is true only in a qualified sense. A battle, undoubtedly, gives scope for virtues of a high sort. Many a bloody field has been glorified by sublimest courage and self-sacrifice. Many soldiers have proved themselves heroic and magnanimous in the deadly crisis of armed conflict. But war does not make a hero out of a poltroon nor a saint out of a dastardly sinner. The brave and virtuous man will be a brave and virtuous soldier, but there is no power of alchemy in bloody strife to transform the base metal of truculence into the gold of real courage. Besides, whatever scope war may give for chivalric and virtuous action, peace gives wider scope for the development and exercise of all virtues. That land is unworthy of liberty which ever suffers the memory of its patriotic defenders on the field of blood to be forgotten, but it is also unworthy and incapable of continued existence if it does not produce contestants on the bloodless fields of peace whose virtues are quite as high as those which shone with transfiguring splendor amidst the murky clouds of battle smoke.

It is easier to be a good soldier than to be a good citizen. It is easier to die for one's country in the intoxicating enthusiasm of war than it is to live for one's country amidst the subtle temptations to self-indulgence or selfish ambition in time of peace. Every day of our life brings opportunities for heroism. Every sphere of

industry gives scope for manifold virtues. The world needs men of honor and industry and benevolence far more than it needs disciplined and skilful soldiers. The faithful citizen, the wise philanthropist, the patient scholar, the diligent artisan, the devoted servant of the public good, all these are needed on loftier and grander fields of action than were ever swept by the armies of a Napoleon or a Von Moltke.

Let us stand with our faces to the future. "*Lebe die Zukunft!*" War belongs to the past with its long, slow struggle out of bestiality and barbarism. With widening intelligence men rise to higher planes of endeavor and conflict. The brotherhood of man is no longer a dream but a begun and growing experience. The nations are clasping hands, even here in "the White City," in a firm pact of mutual good will and mutual service. The arts of peace are driving out the horrid arts of war. East and West, North and South, the nations are feeling a common impulse. It is the gentle but strong force of universal love pulsing from the heart of the Eternal God.

The Christ, who came as the Prince of Peace, at last will see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. Already the prophetic eye beholds the dawn of that day

"When the war-drums throb no longer and the battle-flags are furled,
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

At the close of Dr. Moxom's discourse Rev. Julius E. Grammer, D. D., of Christ's Church, Baltimore, Md., was introduced and spoke as follows on the

RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

"Peace on Earth, Good Will toward Men."

MY FRIENDS — We have met on this day consecrated to high themes and holy resolve, to consider the claim of the Peace Congress and the principles of the Peace movement as consistent with the religion of Christ; and supported by His example and teaching. It is not strange then that ministers of the Gospel should be here, nor are we at a loss for a text on this Lord's Day. The angel sang at His birth, who was the Prince of Peace:

"Peace on earth, good will toward men."

It is an auspicious sign of a great future in the life of this and other nations, that in connection with the World's Fair, there should be a Congress whose object is to cultivate "peace on earth and good will toward men."

If there is truth in the sentiment of the poet that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than those of war," we may well strive to add to those trophies which shall eclipse the bloody record of battles.

It is recorded of Wellington that at Waterloo he said "next to a battle lost, the saddest thing is a battle won." The pride, pomp and circumstance of war are all clouded by the tragic fact that so many precious lives have been sacrificed and so much of sorrow and distress have followed in the path of contending armies. What a price has been paid for those victories, which have often been only temporary or at least which could have been won by appeals to reason and justice!

The "World's Fair" is an exhibition of the *progress* of nations and of a progress *made in time of Peace*. War has done more to arrest that progress than any other cause that could be named. The Latin proverb is "inter arma, silent leges." And not only is the voice of justice and law hushed in the dread clamors of these death-dealing engines, but virtue and truth, happiness and human sympathy, are all swallowed up in the vortex of hate, ambition and cruel jealousy.

If the spirit of the Bible is to be cultivated and practised then we are to strive for that happy time foretold, when nations shall "beat their swords into plough-shares and learn war no more." The Redeemer of the world has told us that His reign is to be introduced not by might nor by power, but by His Spirit. *Truth* is the weapon which shall reach the conscience and heart and intellect of men; and as by a sword of light sever the garments of pride and prejudice and hatred, which hang like a pall over the world. The Peace Congress would really echo the words of God in His controversy with the human soul, "come now and let us reason together." Over the waters of strife it would send forth the dove with the olive leaf in its mouth to speak, in the language of symbol, the truce for which the nations sigh.

No sublimer purpose could animate the minds of this century in this and other lands. Christian statesmen and philosophers, men of culture and of high character, are realizing more and more that *war* is the resort of the savage and barbarian of the lowest form of gregarian life. As man is a social creature, he is dependent upon his fellows both for happiness and true progress. War is destructive of these purposes, and dethrones reason and exalts brute force.

Our Lord commanded His apostle to put up his sword and taught us the lesson of submission to Providence and of trust in the protection and defence of God. He refused to summon legions of angels to his defence and conquered by patience and faith. He was the "Prince of Peace" and his kingdom is one of "righteousness and peace."

It has been said that "war is a necessary evil." It may as well be said that sin is a necessary evil. As man is a rational and responsible being, he is to be governed by those appeals to his reason and conscience which are ordained of God as means of

his restoration to a right mind. "Love is the fulfilling of the law;" and "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor." The religious principles of the peace movement are really founded upon the precepts and practice of Christ. They seek to supplant the pride and ambition, the covetousness and madness of the depraved nature of man by that spirit of forbearance and benevolence, which must, in the end, overcome the powers of carnal warfare. As Christ is "Lord of all" He can hush the storm of worldly contention as well as the swelling sea and lo! there shall be a great calm.

Our trust in this movement is in that power which can turn men's hearts as the rivers of waters. As we believe in God and the Gospel of His Son, so we believe He can make men of one mind and make them to realize that they are all brethren and sons of one Father.

It has been pleaded for war, that it is necessary to preserve the balance of power. But such a plea is not founded in reason, for the balance of power, whether among nations or individuals, is not dependent upon brute force but upon those laws which govern the universe in the distribution of God's gifts, and in the faithful use of them. Virtue, intelligence, industry and providential causes beyond the control of men, produce inequality in power, and so it must ever be "that some are and shall be greater than the rest." The balance of power, when sought to be preserved by war, has been shifted from one side to the other, and the effort has only increased unnatural and artificial distinctions which have intensified hatred and multiplied

CAUSES OF JEALOUSY.

It is very manifest that war has been resorted to in the hope of diverting the people from discontent and insurrection at home, but in every instance the folly has been condemned and the remedy been found worse than the evil. A more mournful example than that of the late Emperor of France cannot be instanced.

Shakespeare makes one of his characters say :

"I well might lodge a fear,
To be again displaced; which to avoid,
I cut them off and had a purpose now
To lead out many to the Holy Land,
Lest rest and lying still might make them look
Too near into my state. Therefore my Harry,
Be it thy course to busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels; that action hence borne out
May waste the memory of former days."

Bitter indeed has been the experience of every such resort, and it has been proved that

"War is a game, that were their subjects wise,
Kings would not play at."

It is painful to see amid the solemn memorials of St. Paul's Cathedral in London that genius has consecrated its finest works of art to commemorate great warriors; while love of country is not inconsistent with love of man, yet the religious principle of the peace movement is that we are to practise the golden rule and to love our neighbor and let the claims of humanity supersede those of nationality.

The effect of such idolatrous love of martial prowess is to engender and foster the war spirit. The heroic character is not set before us for our imitation in the Bible except it be in the practice of a patient and moral courage which made God the ally of every witness to His cause.

"Christianity," says Bishop Watson, "quite annihilates the disposition for martial glory."

The testimony of men distinguished for learning and observation is of much value in this connection. Says Gibbon, the historian, "As long as mankind shall continue to bestow more liberal applause on their destroyers than on their benefactors, the thirst for military glory will ever be the vice of the most excellent characters."

Says the Earl of Shaftesbury, "'Tis strange to imagine that war, which of all things appears the most savage, should be the passion of the most heroic spirits."

It is strange that with all the development which learning and the arts have made, and with all that enters into the intellectual and material progress of the race, and under the light of the glorious Gospel of peace, Christian nations have not yet consented to abolish war.

And if in this closing decade of the nineteenth century, and in this great city, the marvel of American growth, and amid all these tokens of international comity, we, as a Congress, shall be the honored instruments of creating a public opinion in favor of peaceful arbitration of national differences it will, indeed, be a glorious achievement.

Public opinion is a powerful element in the regulation of society and governments. And it is to an enlightened public sentiment we are to trace everlasting and beneficent reformation in laws and manners.

What a happy consummation then would it be if by God's Spirit and His word, and through the agency of His people, we should sing such praises as those of Moses and Miriam, when without a weapon they beheld the victory of faith, and we should learn not to trust in the spear and shield and sword but in the power of *Truth*.

This Peace Congress cherishes the hope that the time is coming when "grim-visaged war shall smooth its wrinkled front," and we shall "hang up its bruised arms for monuments" of a repeated

folly, when we shall no longer witness the awful spectacle of mangled limbs and groaning sufferers, left to die on the field, or to linger out a weary life, burdened with all the miseries of pain and infirmities. Surely it is worth our study and prayers, and our united labors to persuade men that might does not make right, that there is something nobler than shedding human blood for any cause, that it is the part of Christians and wise men, to substitute the olive branch for the sword, and the Dove in place of the Eagle, and to enthrone Reason with the sceptre of Love, in place of Hate and Revenge.

As the motives which lead to war are contrary to the whole teaching and spirit of the Gospel, we feel bound to uphold and advance every effort whose object is to promote peace.

It may be said that war has the claim and prestige of antiquity. So has almost every error and wrong whether it be human slavery or intemperance or idolatry and the grossest forms of superstition.

“There is not, it may be,” says Lord Clarendon, “a greater obstruction to the investigation of truth, or the improvement of knowledge than the too frequent appeal and the too supine resignation of our understanding to antiquity.”

Christ came to make all things new and to do away with the traditions and follies by which men had been held captive.

The forces of His religion are revolutionary by peaceful methods, and He shall overturn and overturn until thrones and dominions and principalities and powers upheld by guns and bayonets shall give place to those laws which in the moral universe are as mighty as are electricity and gravity in their silent strength in the world of matter.

Says Bishop Watson :

“I am persuaded that when the spirit of Christianity shall exert its proper influence over the minds of individuals and especially over the minds of public men in their public capacities ; over the minds of men constituting the Councils of Princes, from whence are the issues of peace and war,—when this happy period shall arrive, war will cease throughout the whole Christian world.”

We have for the authority and principles of this Congress, the benediction of Christ Himself : “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.”

And these are His own words of condemnation of those who resort to war : “They who take the sword, shall perish by the sword.” When the offended disciples would invoke vengeance upon the unbelieving Samaritans, by calling down fire to consume them, He said, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”

We cannot but hail it as a sign of the increasing power of

Christianity, that the disposition to adjust national differences by arbitration is increasing. Before the birth of Christ, the normal condition of the world was that of warfare.

Nations of the greatest culture, as well as the savage and unlettered, were in perpetual hostility. But Christianity has been more and more leavening, and wars have not been so frequent in the Christian era as before. It is a significant fact, that at the birth of Christ, the temple of Janus was for the first time closed.

These gates have been open for long periods of continued hostility, but then there was a general lull in the storms of human passion, as if the world strove intent upon the advent of the Prince of Peace.

The prophecies of the Bible lead us to hope that the time will come, when "nations shall learn war no more." The legacy which Christ left His people was "Peace!", and as we drink of that spirit, we shall commend His religion.

The early Christians renounced revenge and war, and, says Clarkson, "It was not until Christianity became corrupted that Christians became soldiers."

Marcellus was a centurion in the legion called Trojana, and when he became a Christian he threw down his belt at the head of the legion, saying he had become a Christian and that he would serve no longer. Even after Christianity had spread over almost the whole of the known world, Tertullian informs us "that in the Roman armies not a Christian could be found amongst them."

The plea that war was allowed under the Old Testament is easily answered by the fact that "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." It was said of old time "an eye for an eye," but Christ said "love your enemies."

It has been said that good men have advocated and taken part in war. For answer to this it may be said, many good men have resorted to practices which an enlightened conscience condemns. Saul of Tarsus verily thought it was right to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus, and he took the sword of persecution; but the same power which converted him has changed the opinions and prejudices of men as fierce and misguided.

The progress in the development and practice of the principles of the Peace movement is far more to be cherished and extolled than that in mechanics, agriculture or the arts.

Michael Angelo took for his motto the sentiment, "I still learn," and in the study of history and of God's providence, of the Bible and of mankind, we still learn that war is an unmitigated evil. Said Dr. Johnson: "There is reason to expect that as the world is more enlightened, policy and morality will at last be reconciled." Said Henry Clay, the patriot orator and statesman of America, when the war cloud was about to burst upon our land:

"If it were compatible with my official duty and physical strength, I would visit every town, village or hamlet in this wide Union and entreat the people to solemnly pause and contemplate the awful gulf which yawns before them. I would beseech high Heaven to visit us with plague, pestilence and famine or any other scourge, rather than a blind and heedless enthusiasm for military renown."

We have great reason to rejoice that the people with their representatives at home and abroad are sharing in the same spirit. Surely it is a happy sign, when in the English Parliament we read that Mr. Cremer moved "That this House has learned with satisfaction that both Houses of the United States Congress have authorized the President to conclude a treaty of arbitration with any other country, and this House expresses the hope that her Majesty's government will, at the first convenient opportunity, open up negotiations with the government of the United States with a view to the conclusion of such a treaty between the two nations, so that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomacy shall be referred to arbitration."

This is a matter of much encouragement and it is more to rejoice over than the building of cities or the discovery of mines.

The present condition of Europe is enough to convince us that war does not produce a lasting peace, for the menace of great armies is a constant source of suspicious imitation and a provocative to deadly conflict.

In contrast with this condition we would cite the historic precedent of Pennsylvania. Says another: "The security and quiet of Pennsylvania was not a transient freedom from war, such as might accidentally happen to any nation, but she continued to enjoy it for more than seventy years and subsisted in the midst of six Indian nations without so much as a militia for her defence."

Says Clarkson in his life of William Penn, "The Pennsylvanians became armed though without arms; they became strong though without strength. They became safe, without the ordinary means of safety. The constable's staff was the only instrument of authority amongst them for the greater part of a century; and never, during the administration of Penn, or that of his proper successors, was there a quarrel or a war." What an argument for, and illustration of the efficacy of disarmament!

The more we study the subject in every light, the more we are persuaded that, reason and Christianity guiding its conclusions, history and the highest philosophy of government, must condemn the practice of war. As we contemplate the long train of evils which it entails upon the race, of arson and plunder, of rape and murder, of every immorality of which the ungoverned nature of man is capable, leaving want and widowhood, orphanage and imbecility in its path, unfitting men for the pursuits of peace and

the enjoyment of domestic happiness, crippling not only the body, but all the resources of the nation's life, we are resolved to seek peace and promote it on earth.

Says Lord Clarendon in his essays :

“ War introduces and propagates opinions and practices as much against heaven as against earth ; it lays our natures and manners as waste as our gardens and our habitations ; and we can as easily preserve the beauty of the one as the integrity of the other, under the cursed jurisdiction of drums and trumpets.”

We hail the signs of the times, we set before you this long list of treaties which plead for continued arbitration. We unfurl our flag bordered with white, the emblem of the pacific spirit of the nation and we gladly greet the gracious comity which extends a life signal to us. We behold these Peace Congresses, assembling in the centre of the world's progress and power, and we believe in persistent hope, which shall work on

“ Till the war drum throbs no longer
And the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.

“ Then the common sense of most
Shall hold a fretful realm in awe
And the kindly earth
Shall slumber, lapt in universal law.”

We bid you then God speed. Let the echo of the angels' song fill the earth and skies : “ Peace on earth, good will toward men.” May the sweet blessing of Peace rest upon our assembly to-day and may we rise from our deliberations animated by the spirit of that hymn which says :

“ Live for those who love you
For those who know you true ;
For the heaven that bends above you
And waits your coming too.

“ For the cause that needs assistance,
For the wrongs that need resistance,
For the future in the distance,
For the good that you can do.”

The services were closed with prayer by Rev. John M. Baugh, of Iowa, and with the benediction by Dr. Boardman.

FIFTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS.

CO-OPERATING COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

APPOINTED BY THE PEACE SOCIETIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Chairman, Boston, Mass.

ALFRED H. LOVE, Philadelphia, Pa.

MRS. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD, Washington, D. C.

MRS. HANNAH J. BAILEY, Winthrop Centre, Me.

DR. RICHARD H. THOMAS, Baltimore, Md.

MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS.

OFFICIAL DELEGATES APPOINTED BY THE PEACE SOCIETIES AND OTHER BODIES.

AUSTRIAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Wisinger, Mrs. Olga Vienna, Austria.
Wisinger, Oscar Vienna, Austria.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Bonney, Hon. Charles C. Chicago, Ill.
Boardman, Rev. George Dana, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia, Pa.
Butterworth, Hezekiah Boston, Mass.
Campbell, Rev. W. A., D.D. Richmond, Va.
Hartman, Samuel L. Lancaster, Pa.
Hubbard, William G. Columbus, Ohio.
Moxom, Rev. Philip S., D.D. Boston, Mass.
Paine, Hon. Robert Treat Boston, Mass.
Quincy, Hon. Josiah Boston, Mass.
Trueblood, Benjamin F. Boston, Mass.
Wickersham, W. B. Western Springs, Ill.
Wright, Theodore F. Cambridge, Mass.

BALTIMORE YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

Warder, Robert B. Howard University, Washington, D.C.

BALTIMORE YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS (Hicksite).

Cornell, John J. 1923 Park Av., Baltimore, Md.

BIRMINGHAM FRIENDS OF PEACE.

Morgan, Alfred Fairfax, F. R. G. S. Leamington, Eng.
Wright, Thomas Birmingham, Eng.

CHRISTIAN ARBITRATION AND PEACE SOCIETY.

Boardman, Rev. George Dana, D. D., LL.D.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Branson, John	2221 N. Front St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Clubb, Rev. Henry S.	310 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Cross, Rev. Thomas J.	Atlantic City, N. J.
Funk, John F.	Elkhart, Ind.
Grammer, Rev. Julius E., D. D.	Baltimore, Md.

DANISH PEACE SOCIETY.

Meyer, Madame Nico Beck	12 Centennial Court, Chicago, Ill.
Mueller, Dr. J.	Upsala, Sweden.

ECCLESIASTICAL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Campbell, Rev. W. A., D. D.	Richmond, Va.
Fallows, Rt. Rev. Samuel	Chicago, Ill.
Heidt, Rev. John W.	Atlanta, Ga.
Roberts, Rev. William Henry, D. D., LL.D.,	Philadelphia, Pa.

GENERAL GERMAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Richter, Dr. Adolph	Pforzheim, Germany.
-------------------------------	---------------------

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Burroughs, S. M.	67 Holborn Viaduct, London, Eng.
--------------------------	----------------------------------

ILLINOIS PEACE SOCIETY.

Flitcraft, Emma R.	Chicago, Ill.
Minier, George M.	Chicago, Ill.
Plummer, Jonathan W.	Chicago, Ill.
Plummer, Hannah A.	Chicago, Ill.
Smith, Benjamin	Chicago, Ill.
Woodnutt, Thomas W.	Chicago, Ill.

IOWA YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

Arnold, Joseph	Lynnville, Iowa.
Hanson, John Frederick	Mt. Vernon, S. Dak.

INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE OF PEACE AND LIBERTY.

Clerc, M. Jean	Neuchatel, Switzerland.
Love, Alfred H.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lockwood, Belva A.	Washington, D. C.
Richter, Dr. Adolf	Pforzheim, Germany.
Tissot, M. Charles Emile	Berne, Switzerland.

LOMBARD PEACE UNION.

Durante, Oscar	Milan, Italy.
Patrizi, Ettore	Milan, Italy.
Zeggio, V.	Milan, Italy.

LIGUE DU BIEN PUBLIC.

Lockwood, Mrs. Belva A.	Washington, D. C.
---------------------------------	-------------------

LONDON PEACE SOCIETY.

Darby, Dr. W. Evans	47 New Broad St., London, E. C., Eng.
Parker, Mary E.	Dundee, Scotland.

LONDON YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

Baker, Joseph Allen . Woodstock, Craven Park, Willesdon, London, En
 Dorland, John T. Acton Lane, Willesdon, London, Eng.
 Rowntree, James Henry Westwood, Scarborough, Eng.
 Sharp, Isaac London, Eng.
 Thompson, Sylvanus P. . . Chislett Road, West Hampstead, London, Eng.

MENNONITE BRETHREN IN CHRIST.

Hallman, Henry S. Berlin, Ontario, Canada.

MASSACHUSETTS BRANCH OF THE U. P. U.

Lewers, Mrs. Nancy W. Hopedale, Mass.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF
ARBITRATION.

Diggs, Annie L. Washington, D. C.
 Lynndall, Mrs. H. M. Columbus, Ohio.
 Lockwood, Mrs. Belva A. Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

De Voll, Jonathan Gansevoort, N. Y.
 Wood, James Mt. Kisco, N. Y.

NEW YORK YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS (Hicksite).

Wright, Phebe C. Seagirt, N. J.

NEW ENGLAND YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

Hussey, Timothy B. North Berwick, Me.

OHIO YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

Hubbard, William G. Columbus, Ohio.

PEACE DEPARTMENT W. C. T. U.

Bailey, Mrs. Hannah J. Winthrop Centre, Me.
 Collins, Miss Sarah Purchase, New York,

PEACE ASSOCIATION OF FRIENDS IN AMERICA.

Arnold, Joseph Lynnville, Iowa.
 Baldwin, Asa T.
 Collins, Richard S. Purchase, N. Y.
 Collins, Sarah W. Purchase, N. Y.
 Gordon, Luther B. Carthage, Ind.
 Hill, Daniel Richmond, Ind.
 Hill, Tamar T. Richmond, Ind.
 Kendall, John Danville, Ind.
 Raidabaugh, Peter W. 208 Central Union Block, Chicago, Ill.
 Stanley, Martha W. Damascus, Ohio.

PACIFIC COAST ARBITRATION SOCIETY.

Lemmon, Sarah A. P. Oakland, Cal.

RHODE ISLAND PEACE SOCIETY.

Perry, Dr. Amos Providence, R. I.

SWEDISH PEACE SOCIETY.

Hoeckert, Bruno E.	Chicago, Ill.
Lindquist, John Fredric	Upsala, Sweden.
Mueller, Dr. J.	Upsala, Sweden.

SOCIETY FOR THE REFORM AND CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

Tomkins, Frederick James, M. A., D. C. L., 5 Crown Office, Row Temple,
London, Eng.

UNIVERSAL PEACE UNION.

Colby, Clara Berwick	1325 Tenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Deyo, Rev. Amanda	San Diego, Cal.
Ellis, Amos R.	Tacomy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Love, Alfred H.	219 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Lockwood, Belva A.	Washington, D. C.
Miller, J. J. M.	Vera Cruz, Ind.
Moody, Grace R.	Dedham, Mass.
Ormsby, Mary Frost	78 W. 94th St., New York, N. Y.
Ralston, Harriet N.	Washington, D. C.
Thomas, M. Louise	Fordham, New York, N. Y.

OTHER MEMBERS.

Aldrich, H. H.	Board of Trade, Chicago, Ill.
Allen, Benj. Franklin	Atlanta, Ga.
Allen, George W.	Baldwin, Kan.
Anscher, Wm. A. D.	31 Johnson St., Chicago, Ill.
Angus, John	
Avery, Dr. Samuel J.	780 Walnut St., Chicago, Ill.
Avery, Olive L.	780 Walnut St., Chicago, Ill.
Anson, J. Coventry	Saltburn-on-the-sea, Yorkshire, Eng.
Arnet, Bishop Benj. W.	Wilberforce, Ohio.
Andrews, Mrs. L.	641 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.
Archer, James J.	San Francisco, Cal.
Arnold, Edwin C.	20 Willard Place, Chicago, Ill.
Anderson, J. E.	Norse, Texas.
Anderson, Rev. Matthew	1926 S. College Av., Chicago, Ill.
Blakely, Addison	185 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.
Bissell, Clara R.	Aurora, Ohio.
Bement, Addison S.	Toledo, Ohio.
Bush, Miss Minnie	Grand Blanc, Mich.
Buckner, Ella	Ottawa, Kan.
Butler, William O.	641 Carroll Av., Chicago, Ill.
Baccar, Mrs. Mary A.	Lexington, Ky.
Beck, Miss Lenora	The Rookery, Chicago, Ill.
Brewer, Norman J.	Sterling, Neb.
Bjergaard, J. Peterson	Copenhagen, Denmark.
Bulion, W. R.	462 Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
Boardman, Samuel W., D. D.,	Maryville, Tenn.
Brightman, Mrs. N. Arlonine C.	Austin, Ill.
Burns, Rev. J. H.	Edison Park, Ill.

Curtis, Hon. William E.	Washington, D. C.
Cook, George W.	Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Colby, Charlotte S.	6 Mt. Vernon St., Washington, D. C.
Celley, F. M.	291 Thirty-first St., Chicago, Ill.
Carroll, James	Moxatrata, Ohio.
Collett, Howard	Harveysburg, Ohio.
Campbell, Rev. J. M.	Morgan Park, Ill.
Coffman, John S.	Elkhart, Ind.
Colville, William J.	8 South Ada St., Chicago, Ill.
Campbell, Matthew T.	Topeka, Kan.
Cobb, Mrs. S. Maxson	638 E. 56th St., Chicago, Ill.
Carr, J. A.	Hot Springs, Arkansas.
Clous, John W.	West Point, N. Y.
Cotton, A. C.	Vineland, N. Y.
Coffin, Charles F.	4617 Lake Av., Chicago, Ill.
Coffin, Rhoda M.	4617 Lake Av., Chicago, Ill.
Clubb, Mattie W.	2915 Fairhill St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Clubb, Naomi	2915 Fairhill St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Cox, Annie Malcom	717 Harrison St., Chicago, Ill.
Davison, John L.	Carthage, Mo.
Dix, John	Little Britain, Ont., Canada
Doyle, Agnes L.	Saginaw, E. S., Mich.
Dayan, Rev. J. F.	179 Fifty-third St., Chicago, Ill.
Dayan, Mrs. J. F.	179 Fifty-third St., Chicago, Ill.
Dalby, Edmond J.	Sacramento, Cal.
Dohoney, E. L.	Paris, Texas.
Dickey, Rachel A.	248 East Girard Av., Philadelphia, Pa.
Dauncey, H. J.	912 Carroll Av., Chicago, Ill.
Dutton, S. B.	8 South Ada St., Chicago, Ill.
Everett, A. Gordon	137 Portland St., Boston, Mass.
Eaton, Frederick A.	Lodi, Wis.
Easton, H. F. A.	St. Louis, Mo.
Fugh, Arthur H.	Montgomery, Alabama.
Fechtig, James A., Jr.	Baltimore, Md.
Folwell, Prof. William Watts, LL. D.	Minneapolis, Minn.
Frain, Mary J.	602 West Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
French, Anna	Cleveland, Ohio.
Ford, Charles H.	1326 Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
Ferrell, C. C.	University, Miss.
Fracker, George Cutler	Iowa City, Iowa.
Foster, Alonzo F.	Mt. Vernon, Iowa.
Fitz Gerald, Gerald	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Fitz-Gerald, Libbie H.	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Foster, Lois E.	Mt. Vernon, Iowa.
Finkel, Benjamin F.	Kidder, Mo.
Fulcomer, Daniel	University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Fruin, William	4228 Indiana Av., Chicago, Ill.
Grim, J. F. F.	Creston, Iowa.
Green, O. J.	Seattle, Washington.
George, C. Lewis, M. D.	209 W. 44th St., New York, N. Y.
George, Mrs. C. Lewis	209 W. 44th St., New York, N. Y.
George, Mrs. M. J.	1900 N. Pauline St., Chicago, Ill.
Heidt, Miss Carabel	Atlanta, Ga.
Hoyt, Hon. John W.	Washington, D. C.
Hirsch, H. J.	Fort Sheridan, Ill.
Handforth, B. F.	159 Franklin St., Chicago, Ill.

Hjetland, John H.	Leona, Kan.
Hamilton, C. W.	Symco, Wis.
Hadley, Henrietta	352 Hermitage Av., Chicago, Ill.
Hill, T. C.	Western Springs, Ill.
Haskins, C. M.	Columbus, Ohio.
Haskins, Lauretta B.	Columbus, Ohio.
Hinman, Rev. H. H.	Oberlin, Ohio.
Hapley, Georgia,	Columbus, Ohio.
Hunt, T. C.	Blue Island, Ill.
Henrotin, Mrs. Charles	Chicago, Ill.
Heywood, J. Lowell	Aurora, Ill.
Heywood, Mrs. J. L.	Aurora, Ill.
Heywood, Rosa V.	Aurora, Ill.
Hand, Harvey Ledyard	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Hambleton, A. F. N.	Oskaloosa, Iowa.
Hambleton, S. Josepha	Oskaloosa, Iowa.
Irvine, M. B.	Colorado Springs, Col.
Jones, Jennie M.	739 Sedgwick St., Chicago, Ill.
Joyce, M. E.	Comly, Perry Co., Ohio.
King, Miss Isabel	Newton, Mass.
Kelleher, M.	Los Angeles, Cal.
Keith, Elizabeth Edwards	Broken Bow, Neb.
Kelsey, Sarah A.	Western Springs, Ill.
King, Ida	St. Louis, Mo.
Kerns, Walter	Harper, Ill.
Korana, Madame	Beyrout, Syria.
Lucas, Walter Matthew	163 Fifth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Levy, Mose Sam	El Paso, Texas.
Levinson, Bertha	163 Ferry Street, New York, N. Y.
Ludlow, Anna D.	Oswego, N. Y.
Lambert, Vashti A.	Palatine, Ill.
Lieb, Mrs. Herman	616 La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.
Lucas, W. M.	163 Fifth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Langan, William P.	494 N. Ashland St., Chicago, Ill.
Lyon, T. P.	Hibernia, N. Y.
Lyon, Mrs. T. P.	Hibernia, N. Y.
Le Favre, Mrs. Carrica	3716 Lake Av., Chicago, Ill.
Levenson, Dr. Montague R.	327 East 19th St., New York, N. Y.
Landis, W. V. T.	421 S. Ludlow St., Dayton, Ohio.
Martin, T. P.	Green Valley, Ill.
Montague, Miss Zollie	1140 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.
Marsh, J. L.	Saco, Me.
Matlock, Rev. W. H.	Des Moines, Iowa.
Morrill, Mrs. M. J.	Villa Park, Col.
Martin, Anna M.	Lancaster, Pa.
Maser, Henry	Parsons, Kan.
Mann, Mrs. C. A.	Boise City, Col.
Morrison, Bert W.	Peshtigo, Wis.
Meyer, Axel	12 Centennial Court, Chicago, Ill.
McCard, Joseph	236 South Water St., Chicago, Ill.
Munsell, Eva M.	535 Burling St., Chicago, Ill.
Massaquoi, Prince Momulu	Liberia, Africa.
Marr, Daniel	Port Huron, Mich.
Mayson, Miss Alma	Decatur, Ga.
McFarland, W. H.	San Francisco, Cal.
Muller, Minnie L.	764 Sheffield Av., Chicago, Ill.

Monarty, Miss Nettie	Saginaw, E. S., Mich.
Monce, W. L.	Harveysburg, Ohio.
Monce, Clara	Harveysburg, Ohio.
Nixon, William Penn	Chicago, Ill.
North, Levi	Kewanee, Ill.
Pearson, Dr. William L.	Oskaloosa, Iowa.
Power, W. D.	
Price, J. R.	Western Springs, Ill.
Price, Lizzie	Western Springs, Ill.
Pickering, Aquila H.	4583 Oakenwald Av., Chicago, Ill.
Pickering, Mrs. Hannah N. T.	4583 Oakenwald Av., Chicago, Ill.
Pierce, Abby Abbott	474 Bowen Av., Chicago, Ill.
Pittee, Mrs. Charlotte	Battle Creek, Mich.
Pung Kwang Yu	First Sec. of the Chinese Legation, Washington D. C.
Peterson, Carl Frederick	Lindsborg, Kan.
Perren, Rev. Cristopher, Ph. D.	978 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
Pitts, Mary B.	602 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
Riley, Mrs. Katie	Berlin, Wis.
Roberts, Mrs. L.	Canandaigua, N. Y.
Rapp, Christian	Irving Park, Ill.
Robinson, James	Pennick, Ga.
Ray, Thomas	315 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill.
Rogers, Mrs. Elizabeth H.	285 Michigan Av., Chicago, Ill.
Riemer, Rev. W. E. De.	Lomonauk, Ill.
Robinson, Leonora	Baltimore, Md.
Roberts, James H.	Liberal, Mo.
Ruddiman, Mrs. L. E.	423 Crescent Av., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Ruddiman, J. C.	423 Crescent Av., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Ridgway, Robert	Amboy, Ind.
Robinson, Lucy B.	Jacksonville, Florida.
Schmid, Josephine	59 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
Stewart, William Fletcher	Halifax, Florida.
Smith, Caroline	352 Hermitag Av., Chicago, Ill.
Smith, Phebe T.	325 Hermitag Av., Chicago, Ill.
Switzer, Andrew	209 Colyer St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Shaw, Amy C.	Ormond, Florida.
Sebree, Lesley E.	Petersburg, Ky.
Scolford, Henry C.	Loda, Iroquois Co., Ill.
Schreiner, Julia Estey	North Harvey, Ill.
Stofer, Ralph R.	Cleveland, Ohio.
Sunderland, J. T.	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Schwartz, Rosa F.	2958 Fairhill St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Shotts, A. F.	Williamsburg, Iowa.
Smith, James J.	303 Bagley St. Saginaw, Mich., E. S.
St. John, Merle	Salem, Ind.
Scammoun, Miss Arianna E.	5605 Madison Av., Chicago, Ill.
Schmohl, Miss F. J.	923 Otto St., Chicago, Ill.
Swoboda, Bertha	Fancy Creek, Kan.
Safford, Wm. C.	Columbus, Ohio.
Sickels, Emma C.	Chicago, Ill.
Swahlen, Wm. F.	Greencastle, Ind.
Stebbins, Alice B.	Atchison, Kan.
Seward, Miss L. M.	125 Cadiz St., New Orleans, La.
Stern, Herman	413 Fourth Av., New York, N. Y.
Smith, Ebbie Knox	Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.

Tepe, William	Covington, Ky.
Trump, Rev. C. S.	Martinsburg, Ill.
Trump, Mrs. C. S.	Martinsburg, Ill.
Thurston, Thomas A.	Memphis, Tenn.
Thurston, Mrs. T. A.	Memphis, Tenn.
Taylor, Joseph E.	Glenwood, Col.
Tuck, Rev. Edward A.	86 Landis St., Newburg, N. Y.
Underwood, Zephi	Harveysburg, Ohio.
Underwood, T. Catherine	Harveysburg, Ohio.
Underwood, D. B.	Harveysburg, Ohio.
Vance, Alfred H.	Topeka, Kan.
Van Allen, D. D.	C amden, N. Y.
Violette, E. M.	Clinton, Mo.
Watson, Mrs. S. B.	311 S. Roby St., Chicago, Ill.
Wright, Alfred W.	Norristown, Pa.
Worcester, M. L.	Kingston, Ill.
Wooton, A. J.	Pleasant Plain, Iowa.
Webster, Howard J.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Waldon, Fannie	Bucyrus, Ohio.
Wallace, George J.	Cleveland, Ohio.
Wheeler, Wayne Bidwell	Oberlin, Ohio.
Walker, D. A.	Woolloomoloo, N. S. Wales.
Walsh, Jessie S.	Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
Watson, William	Aberdeen, Scotland.
Wylie, Cameron C.	Helena, Mont.
Willard, Laura	5555 Woodlawn Av., Chicago, Ill.
White, Venia M.	Columbia, Me.
Westervelt, William D.	512 W. Erie St., Chicago, Ill.
Warner, Charles	94 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.



INDEX.

- Address of Welcome, 9
 Aldrich, H. H., 274ff
 American Peace Society, 49, 50, 66, 320
 Arbitration in Schools, 207, 258
 Association des Jeunes Amis de la Paix, 62
 Association for the Reform and Codification of International Law, 70, 197, 208, 323
 Austrian Peace Society, 35, 64, 320


 Bayard, Ambassador, 30
 Baroness von Suttner, 35, 36, 133
 Bajer, Fredrik, 63, 254
 Baird, Thomas, 125
 Bailey, Mrs. Hannah J., 126
 Baltimore Y. M. of Friends, 320
 Behring Sea Arbitration, 29, 153, 182, 206, 229
 Beckwith, Harriet Hoffman, 144
 Bishop of Durham, 43
 Birmingham Friends of Peace, 320
 Björnson, Björnstjörne, 42
 Blymyer, W. H., 261
 Bonney, Hon. C. C., 9, 11, 21, 31, 41
 Boardman, President S. W., 122
 Boardman, Rev. George Dana, 217, 301
 Bonghi, Ruggero, 79
 Bryan, Hon. Thomas B., 11
 Branson, John, 123
 Braithwaite, W. C., 56
 Brainerd, Cephas, 159
 Butler, Hon. Wm. Allen, 159
 Burdens Imposed by War on the People, 114ff
 Business Committee of Fifth Congress, 87
 Butterworth, Hezekiah, 11
 Burroughs, S. M., 281
 Cases Settled by Arbitration, 29
 Cablegrams of Greeting, 44, 224
 Campbell, Rev. W. A., 146, 211, 301
 Causes of International Animosities, 231
 Christ's Place in the Peace Movement, 122
 Character of the Indians, 141
 Chase, Lucy, 203
 Christian Arbitration and Peace Association, 68, 321
 Clerc, Jean, 44
 Clubb, Rev. H. S., 239
 Cost of Wars, 97ff, 169, 116
 Cotton, A. C., 142
 Conditions Essential to Peace, 212ff
 Condition of the Russian People, 243ff
 Committee of Arrangements for next Congress, 248
 Committee to go to Washington, 295
 Committee on Court of Arbitration, 295, 300
 Courts of Conciliation, 270
 Commercial Arbitration by Boards of Trade, 274
 Cremer, Henry Randal, 54, 59
 Cridge, Alfred, 119, 291
 Customs Tariffs and Peace, 281ff
 Curtis, Hon. Wm. E., 186
 Curse of War upon Woman, 130

 Darby, Dr. W. Evans, 9, 31, 46, 94, 154, 178, 184, 208, 230, 248, 249, 250f, 254, 295
 Denmark Neutralization Society, 63, 321
 Deyo, Rev. Amanda, 120, 126, 130, 230, 257
 Destruction of Men and Material Losses, 95, 158
 Dorland, John T., 90
 Disarmament, 222, 305
 Ducommun, Elie, 71ff


- Eaton, Hon. Dorman B., 159
 Ecclesiastical Peace Conference, 146ff, 294, 321
 England and United States Committed to Peace Policy, 30
 Eve, Maria Louise, 45
 Familistère de Guise, 62
 Fallows, Bishop Samuel, 186, 203
 FitzGerald, Gerald, 259
 Fischer-Lette, Marie, 134
 Field, Hon. David Dudley, 78, 90
 First Mention of Universal Peace Congress, 75
 First Peace Societies, 48, 65
 Folwell, Professor William Watts, 270
 Fraternal Union of Peoples, 230
 French Women's Protest, 131
 Franck, A., 75, 77
 Frankfort Arbitration Association, 63
 Geographical Position of United States Favorable to Peace, 22
 Geneva Arbitration, 29, 206
 General German Peace Society, 321
 Gobat, Dr., 85, 86, 103
 Greetings, 44
 Grammer, Rev. Julius E., 212, 312
 Griess-Traut, Madame, 260, 262
 Hale, Edward Everett, 166
 Hanson, John F., 124
 Hartman, Samuel L., 210
 Henrotin, Mrs. Charles, 11
 History and Work of Peace Societies in America, 65ff
 History and Work of Peace Societies in Europe, 56ff
 History of Peace Congresses, 70, 71ff
 Hill, Daniel, 207, 260
 Hoyt, ex-Gov. John W., 225
 How to Remove International Animosities, 233
 Hornby, Sir Edmond, 166, 181
 Hoeckert, B. E., 290
 Howard, General Charles H., 154
 Howe, Julia Ward, 132
 Hughes, Rev. Hugh Price, 43
 Hubbard, W. G., 42, 71
 Hugo, Victor, 72
 Illinois Peace Society, 321
 Iowa Y. M. Friends, 321
 Importance of the Federal System of Government, 24
 Influence of Large Population under One Government, 23
 Influence of the Exposition, 38, 228, 313
 International Arbitration, 112, 153
 International Tribunal of Arbitration, 10, 71, 89, 124, 159ff, 166, 168ff, 173ff, 176ff, 178ff, 181ff, 292
 International Arbitration and Peace Association, 54, 60, 321
 International Arbitration League, 54, 59
 International Peace Bureau, 81, 246, 250
 International American Congress, 186ff, 194ff
 International Law, 196, 209.
 Interparliamentary Conferences, 82f
 Interparliamentary Peace Bureau, 85
 Industrial Arbitration, 264, 270, 274, 287, 289
 Kirkland, Mrs., 120
 Korana, Madame, 39
 Landis, Mr., 260
 Levenson, Dr. M. R., 173ff, 261
 Lemonnier, Charles, 53, 61, 77, 171
 Lemon, Mrs. J. C. 141
 Ligue du Bien Public, 87, 88, 321
 Ligue Internationale de la Paix et de la Liberté, 53, 73, 321
 Ligue Internationale de la Paix, 52, 73
 London Peace Society, 31, 49, 53, 321
 London Y. M. of Friends, 322
 Love, Alfred H., 67, 142, 154, 205, 212, 251, 256, 257, 263, 289, 296
 Lockwood, Mrs. Belva A., 103, 120, 138, 168, 184, 251, 256, 259, 263


- Massaquoi, Prince Momolu, 33
 Mass. Branch of U. P. U., 322
 Mazzoleni, Angelo, 95
 Members of the Congress, 320
 Mennonites, 322
 Message from Suffrage Congress, 261
 Message to Queen Victoria and President Cleveland, 154
 Meyer, Madame Nico Beck, 41, 248, 252
 Militarism in Europe, 32, 93, 97ff, 115
 Military Man's View of Arbitration, 154ff
 Miller, J. J. M., 123, 252, 257
 Moscheles, Felix, 216
 Moxom, Rev. Philip S., 201, 301
 Moneta, E. T., 37, 62, 104
 Morgan, Alfred F., 56
 Mueller, Dr. J., 40, 65, 255, 291
 National Association for Promotion of Arbitration, 322
 Nationalism and Internationalism, 217ff, 246, 293
 Neutrality of the Great Lakes, 183, 293
 New York Y. M. of Friends, 322
 New England Y. M. of Friends, 322
 Nixon, William Penn, 152, 159, 166, 173, 176
 Officers of the Congress, 4
 Ohio Y. M. of Friends, 322
 Organization of the Congress, 3, 10
 Origin of Peace Societies, 46ff
 Ormsby, Mary Frost, 135
 Pacific Coast Arbitration Society, 322
 Pax Humanitate, 64
 Patrizi, Ettore, 37f
 Passy, Frederic, 52, 73, 77
 Paine, Hon. Robert Treat, 154, 160, 181, 263, 297ff
 Pease, Sir Joseph, 42
 Peace Movement in Europe, 35, 36, 293
 Peace and Prosperity, 38
 Peace to the World, 45
 Peace Association of Friends in America, 67, 207, 323
 Peace Flags, 114, 135
 Peace Victorious, 125
 Peace Plow, 206
 Peace Propaganda in the Schools, etc., 143, 257
 Pension System of United States, 26
 Peraza, Sr. Don Nicanor Bolet, 194
 Perren, Rev. C., 90
 Perry, Dr. Amos, 259
 Popular Government, 24
 Potonié, Edmond, 88
 Power of Public Opinion, 21
 Pratt, Hodgson, 43, 54, 60, 75, 230
 President of United States as Arbitrator, 28
 Principles of First Peace Societies, 50f
 Price, J. R., 257
 Prophecies of Peace and War, 239
 Program of the Congress, 5ff
 Purpose of the Peace Movement, 10, 57, 69
 Pung Kwang Yu, 37
 Quincy, Hon. Josiah, 21, 33, 42, 87, 90
 Resolutions of Peace Congresses and Conferences, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 292
 Resolutions of Thanks, 296, 297
 Reform of International Law, 196
 Representation of Societies in Peace Congresses, 249ff
 Reform in Representation, 119, 287, 291
 Religious Principles of the Peace Movement, 312
 Rhode Island Peace Society, 322
 Richard, Henry, 72, 200, 224
 Richter, Dr. Adolf, 35, 114, 249
 Roby, Mrs. Edward, 138
 Roberts, Rev. William H., 146, 152
 Ruchonnet, Louis, 64, 80
 Snape, Thomas, M. P., 43


- Société de la Morale Chrétienne, 49, 61
 Société Française de l'Arbitrage entre Nations, 61
 Social and Moral Aspects of War, 301
 Society of Friends, 60, 67
 Spence, Catherine H., 287
 State Arbitration in Massachusetts, 264ff
 Stevens, Bishop, 204
 Standing Armies of United States, Germany and France compared, 25
 Supreme Court of the United States, 24
 Sufficiency of Moral Sanctions, 202, 210
 Sunday Service, 301
 Sympathy between United States and England, 32, 181
 Swedish Peace Society, 40, 63, 323
 The New Song, 130
 Thomas, M. Louise, 242
 Time and Place of next Peace Congress, 248
 Tolstoi, Count, 243
 Tomkins, Dr. Frederic J., 196
 Treaties of United States with other Countries, 27
 Tripiet, Jules, 261
 Trueblood, B. F., 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 44, 65, 87, 94, 166, 178, 185, 248, 249, 251, 252f, 257, 295
 Universal Peace Petition, 253ff
 Universal Peace Union, 67, 323
 Unione Lombarda, 37, 62, 321
 University Peace Societies, 36, 294
 War and the Liquor Traffic in Africa, 34
 Waste and Recoil of Aggressive War, 90ff
 Walcott, Charles H., 264
 White City by the Inland Sea, 12
 What is War? 105ff
 Wisinger, Madame Olga, 35
 Woman's Power to Suppress War 126, 138, 139, 142, 144
 Wood, James, 162, 176, 248
 Work of the Peace Societies, 69ff
 World's Congress Auxiliary, 3, 9, 87, 296
 Wright, Thomas, 245
 W. C. T. U. Peace Department, 68, 322
 Zeggio, Victor, 112











UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY,
BERKELEY

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

Books not returned on time are subject to a fine of
50c per volume after the third day overdue, increasing
to \$1.00 per volume after the sixth day. Books not in
demand may be renewed if application is made before
expiration of loan period.

MAR 5 1925

MAY 10 1929

JUL 5 - 1966

IN STACKS

2 - 1966

AUG 5 '66

Patterson

SEP 5 '66

BH

SEP 26 '66

Due and not returned Period
subject to recall after -

REC'D LD JUL 12 71 -4 PM 45

REC. CIR. MAR 24 77

RECEIVED

SEP 23 '66 -2 PM

LOAN DEPT.

NOV 15 1966 3 3

IN STACKS

NOV 1 1966

DEC 15 '66

DEC 13 '66 -8 PM

LOAN DEPT.

JUL 2 1 '71 27

SEP 17 1977 6 6

15m-12, '24

YC 66449

5, 50

50-74100

141

279615

JX 1930

.45

1893

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

